THE UNITARIAN

APRIL, 1910

A MAGAZINE OF DEFINITE PROGRESS AND A VIRILE OPTIMISM IN RELIGION

KNOW THE TRUTH AND THE TRUTH SHALL MAKE YOU FREE

EDITED FROM THE NEW YORK UNITARIAN HEADQUARTERS 104 EAST TWENTIETH STREET NEW YORK, AND ISSUED THE FIRST DAY OF EACH MONTH

ONE DOLLAR A YEAR

TEN CENTS A COPY

Our National Societies

With headquarters in the building of the **American Unitarian Association, 25 Beacon Street, Boston, Mass.**

Local offices at 104 East 20th Street, New York City; 175 Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.; and Cor. Franklin and Geary Streets, San Francisco, Cal.

The American Unitarian Association.

Founded in 1825.

The chief missionary organization of the Unitarian churches of America. It supports missionaries, establisnes and maintains churches, holds conventions, aids in building meeting meeting-houses, publishes books. tracts, and devotional works.

Address correspondence to the *Secretary*, Rev. Lewis G. Wilson.

Address contributions to the *Treasurer*, Francis H. Lincoln, Esq.

Publication Agent, Mr. C. L. Stebbins.

Unitarian Sunday-School Society.

Founded in 1827.

Maintained by the Unitarian churches to promote religious and moral education. Publishes manuals and tracts, issues a Sunday-school paper, holds conventions, carries on a book-room. Branch at 175 Dearborn Street, Chicago.

President, Rev. Edward A. Horton.

Treasurer. Mr. Richard C. Humphreys.

Superintendent of book-room, Mr. Philip C. McMurdie

National Alliance of Unitarian Women.

Organized in 1890.

Promotes the loca organization of the women of the Unitarian churches for missionary and denominational work.

Address correspondence to the *Clerk*, Miss Florence Everett.

Address contributions to the *Treasurer*, Mrs. Lucia Clapp Noyes, Mattapan, Mass.

Young People's Religious Union.

Organized in 1896,

Promotes the organization of the young people of the Unitarian churches for "Truth, Worship and Service."

Address correspondence to Miss Grace R. Torr.

Address contributions to the *Treasurer*, Mr. O. Arthur McMurdie.

Unitarian Temperance Society.

Organized in 1886.

The practical working committee of the Unitarian churches to promote the cause of temperance by publishing and freely distributing pamphlets and tracts, arranging for conferences, and sending speakers upon request to give addresses on various phases of the temperance question.

Rev. Joseph H. Crooker, D. D., *President*.

Rev. A. D. K. Shurtleff, *Secretary*.

Address all correspondence to the President, 820 Smith St., Roslindale, Boston, Mass.

Address contributions to the *Treasurer*, Mr. Charles H. Stearns.

The Meadville Theological School

(Founded 1844.)

MEADVILLE, PA.

Trains men and women for a liberal and progressive ministry. For catalogue address the President,

F. C. SOUTHWORTH.

PROCTOR ACADEMY

ANDOVER N. H.

A Unitarian School for both sexes. Tuition and Board $250 a year. Courses in Business and Domestic Science. College Certificate. New Gymnasium. New Separate Dormitories.

Box 167, Andover, N. H.

T. P. FARR, Principal.

POWDER POINT SCHOOL

FOR BOYS

Box 838, DUXBURY, MASS.

Elementary and advanced classes

H. P. MOULTON, Jr., Principal

Course in FORESTRY

F. B. KNAPP, Director

BOOK OF THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF RELIGIOUS LIBERALS

FREEDOM AND FELLOWSHIP IN RELIGION

A full record of the proceedings, addresses and papers of the recent International Congress of Religious Liberals in Boston, September 22-27, 1907.

EDITED BY

CHAS. W. WENDTE

LARGE OCTAVO, 650 PAGES, WITH 55 PORTRAITS

Price One Dollar; postage 23 cents additional

Address:

CHAS. W. WENDTE, Sec'y International Council

25 Beacon Street, Boston, Mass.

Contents for April, 1910

		PAGE
Editorials		113
Our Responsibility to the College Towns	H. W. F.	115
Poem—Watchman, What of the Night	Samuel Longfellow	115
The Problem of Liberal Religion in the West.	Rev. Wm. T. Brown	116
Unitarian Hymn-Writers		119
The Relation of the Church to the Social Injustice of the Time	Rev. Howard C. Ives	124
Our Unitarian Opportunity	Jas. G. Townsend, D. D.	127
Future American and Country Town		129
Some Necessary Needs		132
Poem—A Hymn for the Living Church		132
Mrs. Eliza Read Sunderland		133
Unitarian Conference of Middle States and Canada		136
The Modern Church	Rev. John Haynes Holmes	137
The Children of the Church	Anita Trueman Pickett	139
Our Readers Exchange	Frederic J. Gauld	141
Symposium		142
New England Letter	Rev. Alson H. Robinson	146
All Souls Church		143
Notes from the Field		150

THE UNITARIAN

Editorial Rooms 104 East Twentieth Street New York

CHANGE OF ADDRESS. Subscribers requesting a change of address must give OLD as well as the NEW address.

DISCONTINUANCES. It is found that a large majority of our subscribers prefer not to have their subscriptions interrrupted and their files broken in case they fail to remit before expiration. It is therefore assumed that continuance is desired unless subscribers order discontinuance, either when subscribing or at any time during the year, and payment of all arrearages is expected when discontinuance is ordered. PRESENTATION COPIES: Many persons subscribe for friends, intending that the paper shall stop at the end of the year. If instructions are given to this effect they will receive attention at the proper time.

Send remittances for subscriptions by Check, Money Order or Registered Letter, made payable to THE UNITARIAN, and address our New York office, 104 East Twentieth Street.

Entered as second-class matter January 4, 1907, at the post office at Sidney, New York, under the of Act Congress of March 3, 1879.

PRUETT PUBLISHING COMPANY, Sidney, N. Y.

T. FORTSON PRUETT, President and Treasurer, N. A. PRUETT, Secretary

One Dollar a Year

Ten Cents a Copy

Pruett Publishing Company

PRINTERS and PUBLISHERS

SIDNEY, NEW YORK

Would like to quote you on anything you may need in the way of printing. We guarantee good work at reasonable prices. Favor us with a trial order. . . . .

PRUETT PUBLISHING COMPANY
SIDNEY, NEW YORK.

At the Year's High-Tide

By GEORGE HENRY BADGER

¶ A group of verses of the Out-of-Doors: Companion to "Sea Woods" but with a wider range, and mostly with a more distinctive religious tone.

¶ In paper, twenty-four pages, with cover of blue, embellished with a mountain photograph. Price twenty-five cents. Postage two cents.

THE PRUETT PUBLISHING COMPANY
104 East Twentieth Street, New York

THE UNITARIAN.

Vol. V (New Series.) APRIL, 1910 No. 4

THE UNITARIAN

Editorial Office 104 East Twentieth St., New York
GEORGE H. BADGER, Editor

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

John Haynes Holmes
Charles Wesley Casson
Henry Wilder Foote
Edgar Swan Wiers
Frederic Robertson Griffin
Alson Haven Robinson

Contributing Editors—Rev. Thomas R. Slicer, of New York; Rev. Jabez T. Sunderland of Hartford, Conn; Pres. Franklin C. Southworth of Meadville, Pa.; Rev. Thomas Van Ness, of Boston, Mass.; Rev. H. Elmer Gilchrist, of New Orleans, La.; Rev. Wilson M. Backus of Minneapolis.

FOR four years THE UNITARIAN has been doing what it can to produce constructive evidence that the things it stands for are worth while. As announced last month, its Editorial board has been recruited by the enlistment of an alert company of young Associate Editors who will share with the Editor the responsibilities of its practical conduct. This involves no radical change of policy, no abandonment of initial ideals, no modification of original intent. Rather it means a firmer reinforcement and sharper emphasis of these things.

We deem it worth while, at this time, to formulate in rather explicit terms the essential aims for which we are united in this enterprise.

THE UNITARIAN is urgent for a clear-cut, frankly avowed, and vigorously progressive *denominational ideal.* We believe that the real work of religion is larger than can be comprehended in the enterprise of any church: we believe that the veritable Church of God must always involve more than the triumph of any denomination. But the specific business of THE UNITARIAN is to help the churches of the Unitarian order to attain as completely as possible to the *real fact* of religion: and to bear as large a share of the real work of the Church of God as can be made feasible. We are concerned not very much about the traditions of the Unitarianism-That-Has-Been: we are very much concerned about the Unitarianism-That-Is-Becoming.

———o———

THE UNITARIAN will continuously urge for an aggressive missionary policy; incidentally for the multiplication of Unitarian churches; chiefly for the wider extension of Unitarian ideals and principles amongst all sorts and conditions of men. It will urge for genuineness of utterance everywhere and the abandonment of all obstructing traditions, for progressiveness of methods,—for a more democratic scope and more constructively eager program in all our denominational endeavor.

THE UNITARIAN is urgent for a closer identification of the ideals of religion with the immediate impulses of social regeneration and civic and industrial righteousness stirring in our times. It is committed to no particular program of social reform: it will spend little time in the denunciation of things that now stand: but it will urge for alert conscience, open mind, and fearless endeavor for essential progress in the real fact of human brotherhood, amongst those enlisted in the work of our churches.

———o———

THE UNITARIAN is continuously urgent for an extension in our midst of the habit of open and frank discussion of all matters vitallypertaining to our faith and aims. We deem it more wholesome that our people develop sensitiveness as to any tendency to stifle the expression of honest conviction, than sensitiveness to the discomfiture of hearing what one does not agree with. While not encouraging the spirit of carping criticism and irresponsible fault-finding, we urge for the habit of generous exchange of ideas regarding the issues that are of the day and the hour in our active religious interests.

———o———

THE UNITARIAN had its inception, and its first hearty endorsement in the Unitarian Conference of the Middle States and Canada, and is in a vital sense a child of that Conference. In no wise a local organ, merely, but seeking always to give expression to a growing impulse of denominational development that is genuinely, consistently and comprehensively, national and continental in its scope, it finds in the spirit of the Conference of the Middle States and Canada a peculiarly congenial back-ground of hearty support and vital sympathy for the ideas for which it stands. But it is specifically the organ of an *American* Unitarianism, with no element of our American life and aspiration disregarded and with an especially hospitable feeling for the close community of interests and identity of aims which bind the churches of Canada with those of the United States in closest fellowship of service.

———o———

THE UNITARIAN stands steadfast for explicit "Togetherness" in our denominational enterprises. It will support with eager sympathy our national organizations. It will urge for the most cordial co-operation of all our churches and people with the American Unitarian Association as our most effectual method of united denominational enterprise. It believes in the strengthening of that organization in every rational way, and it will not refrain from the constructive friendliness of criticism and suggestion for reform when occasion makes such friendliness timely. It will urge for the most democratic and logically progressive methods in the out-working of our denominational development. It will modestly shrink from the responsibility of exact infallibility in such matters: it will genially insist upon the the responsibilities of the courage of its own convictions. The one end in view shall be always greater efficiency in the achievement of the things to which we aspire.

———o———

FINALLY, THE UNITARIAN is endeavoring always to be interesting and alive: to deal with things that are worth while, in a way that shall make people believe that they are worth while.

OUR RESPONSIBILITY TO THE COLLEGE TOWNS

ADJOINING the campus of the University of Wisconsin and directly opposite the University Y. M. C. A. is the handsomest church in Madison, a brand-new Gothic structure, costing $65,000. It has been erected by the Roman Catholic church for the use of students in the university, and is to be followed by a guild-hall and other buildings through which the church proposes to keep its grip upon its young men and women while in Madison. This building is one of many indications of a striking reversal of policy in the Roman Church. Formerly it tried, by every means in its power to keep its young people away from the state institutions: finding that impossible, the church is now following them to the very doors of the universities. The Protestant churches too are waking up to the fact that at these great institutions of learning is the finest opportunity which the country offers for influencing the moral and spiritual life of the century. Hence the rapid and significant development of church work in almost every university town in the west. We need to rouse ourselves to the opportunities which other churches are seizing. The Unitarian church was the first body in America to see the strategic value of the college town, and it planted churches in Ann Arbor and Madison and other educational centers many years ago. But today we are in danger of falling behind. The work, where already established, needs the reinforcement of greater resources; and we ought to put new churches in several rising college towns. More men qualified for this peculiar field, and more money to make the work effective—these are essential if we are to do our share in this great work. It is not a question of counting mere denominational gains. Rather we are offered an opportunity of bringing into the spiritual treasure-house of the nation the particular talent which is ours. In every college and university young men and women are striving to find an interpretation of the world which shall satisfy the modern heart and brain. If we have any message of truth and freedom and service for the world today there is no more important place for its delivery than at the college gate. Here the students come thronging in, eager for truth, generous-hearted in desire to serve. Hence the same students go out into the world to mold the public morality and the spiritual ideals which shall be dominant for half a century. Let us open our eyes to the opportunity and devote our hands and hearts to this great chance to strengthen and purify these ceaseless streams of young life.

H. W. F.

"Watchman, What of the Night?"

Out of the dark the circling sphere
Is rounding onward to the light;
We see not yet the full day here,
But we do see the paling night;

And Hope, that lights her fadeless fires,
And Faith, that shines, a heavenly will,
And Love that courage re-inspires,—
These stars have been above us still.

O sentinels! whose tread we heard
Through long hours when we could not see,
Pause now; exchange with cheer the word—
The unchanging watchword—Liberty!

Look backward, how much has been won;
Look round, how much is yet to win!
The watches of the night are done;
The watches of the day begin!

O Thou, whose mighty patience holds
The night and day alike in view,
Thy will our dearest hopes enfold,
Oh keep us steadfast, patient, true!

—*Samuel Longfellow.*

The Problem of Liberal Religion in the West

By REV. WILLIAM THURSTON BROWN

I AM glad to respond to THE UNITARIAN request for a statement as to the problem of the liberal church in the west as contrasted with the east. By "the west" it should be understood that the Rocky Mountain States are meant. I cannot speak for the churches on the Coast, where conditions are somewhat different.

That there should naturally be some difference between the problem of Unitarian churches in New England and that of Unitarian churches in the west will be obvious. When I was about to leave Boston for my work as Field Secretary, one of our best-known ministers, well acquainted with conditions both east and west, said to me: "Brown, I envy you. The civilization of Boston is a spent civilization. Only in the new life of the west is there hope of advance."

Whether this estimate of the civilization of Boston be correct or not, I leave to others to settle. Of one thing I am sure: the problem of liberal religious work in this western country is widely different from anything our churches in New England and the east seem aware of. Of the whole number of our churches, more than half are located in New England, nearly 200 in Massachusetts. Of the latter about half were founded before the 19th century opened, over 30 before the beginning of the 18th century. Of the 265 churches listed for New England in our Year Book, 188 were established before 1865. Only 77 have been organized since the Civil War, and fully 20 of these have either been discontinued or have summer services only.

Naturally, very many of these old churches are simply bequests from the past, and not the answer of any profoundly felt need of the present. How many of them would be built or organized, if they did not already exist? How many of them represent a distinctly *liberal* demand today? They observe customs and rites, not because the life of today feels the need of them, but because these customs and rites are part of the church inheritance. These customs and rites and traditions are no part of liberalism at all. Against them some of the most valiant souls in our history have rebelled.

For example, many of our eastern churches observe communion, administer the ordinance of baptism, and incline toward ritualism. Is it because modern life demands these for its religious expression? Not at all. It has completely outgrown them all. Was it not largely because his own growing spirit could not be cramped with in the hard shell of inherited forms, that Emerson resigned from the pastorate of the Second Church in Boston and left the ministry? His Divinity School Address was not written for the express purpose of exalting the policy of attempting to put new wine into old bottles.

Is it too much to say, further, that there is a considerable element in our older New England churches which is liberal only in name? The term "Channing Unitarians" was in vogue some years ago. If that epithet was intended to describe people who had made a fetich of Channing's supposed theological belief, it was misapplied. The true Channing Unitarians might not cherish a single belief held by that great pioneer. Are they not, rather, the men and women who possess the same intellectual enterprise and the same spiritual and moral earnestness in the work of today that Channing showed nearly a century ago?

The common use of the term "Christ" or "Jesus Christ" by our eastern preachers and the almost evident effort to use as far as possible the same forms of expression as the orthodox ministers indicate an attitude of mind practically unknown and impossible in this part of the west. Why liberal ministers who claim fellowship with liberal Jews should

cling to this misleading term, unless they still hold to the dogma of the trinity in a modified form, some of us cannot understand.

In the west, the conditions are almost as different as can be imagined. Unitarian churches cannot exist here on the strength of tradition, for no Unitarian tradition exists. Not a single Unitarian church in any city of the Rocky Mountain States could be organized or maintained, even with the help of the A. U. A. solely by the contributions of people who have had Unitarian training. Unitarianism here must mean liberalism else it means or can mean nothing.

I suppose some people come to the west from Unitarian churches in the east. Some of them become useful members of Unitarian churches here. But many of them do not. Their membership in the east has not meant membership in a *liberal movement*, but membership in an ancient church, often the social center of the community. It is perfectly natural for such people to identify themselves with a church in the west whose membership carries with it social prestige. This is especially true in the case of people who are called wealthy or successful. Only a very small number of our church members here are Unitarian by training.

The one thing best worth knowing about liberalism in the west is this, that it must stand or fall wholly on its merits as a movement. That means that it must furnish an interpretation of life, a purpose and a motive, not only widely different from what orthodoxy represents, but such as squares with the teachings of modern science and is adequate to the growing needs of modern life. The challenge of the west to liberal churches is similar to the challenge of America to Channing and Emerson and Parker seventy-five years ago.

In Boston, our modern capitalism is still tempered by the surviving culture and idealism of earlier days. In the west, it is exceedingly raw. Here it possesses no moral idealism. Nowhere has the struggle between capitalists and laborers been so bitter, or so illuminating for those who were not blind, as in this mining country. "Dagoes are cheaper than props"—the remark of Colorado mine owners—may fairly be taken as the frank creed of capitalism in these States. The articles in *Everybody's* by Judge Ben B. Lindsay amply justify every claim or contention of the Western Federation of Miners in their struggle with the same "Beast" which the pioneer of penal reform for juvenile offenders is fighting.

It may be that in New England the chief business of our Unitarian churches is to furnish a place where men who are wearied by the cares of commercialism during the week can go on Sundays and forget their troubles, not be reminded by anything they see or hear of the economic struggle and its human tragedy. That may be the case—in the east. But it is not the case here.

There are men and women in the west, of course, who prefer not to hear of this life and death struggle from the pulpit, as there were people seventy-five years ago who did not care to hear about the movement against slavery—utterly insignificant as that movement was, compared with the social struggle of today—but few of our western capitalists attend Unitarian churches.

None of the churches in this department observe communion. Only one or two has what would be called a pulpit. The pulpit is rather a platform, and in many places the church building is a hall. Even in Helena, where some of our ablest and most conservative ministers have served, the church building resembles a theater, and the pulpit is a stage. In other words, our churches here are not designed for what is usually called worship. Perhaps worship is differently conceived here.

Another condition obtains here which does not obtain in the east. A much larger proportion of the material support of our churches comes from men and women who are either openly identified with the modern Socialist movement or deeply interested in it. Take two or three examples. Fully two-thirds—probably three-fourths—of the total contributions for the support of the Butte church during the eight years of its existence have come from persons

who are either Socialists or inclined that way. Two men in that society—one, a lawyer, the other, an employee of a mining corporation—have each contributed annually to the Butte church a larger amount than any single subscriber in any other church of this department, except possibly two in the Salt Lake church.

It might be thought that a conservative preacher, or one who emphasized the so-called spiritual side of religion—though I do not admit that religion has a side so profoundly spiritual as is involved in the social gospel—would have realized larger returns in a financial way at Butte than its Socialist minister. I doubt it. Butte is a pretty good example of what the capitalist-labor struggle can do toward making a hell on earth—though Pittsburg and many other places are far ahead in this respect. Probably a preacher of "the simple gospel" of salvation could have secured some support from men like Senator Clark—who secured a United States Senatorship by purchasing a Montana legislature—but such a man could not have had the support of those who have given so generously of time and means for its maintenance these eight years.

One of the oldest members of the Salt Lake Unitarian church—one of the city's best-loved citizens—is and has been for years an outspoken Socialist. No one gives more generously than he to its support. At least two of the Board of Trustees are Socialists, one is a Single Taxer, and two or three others strongly sympathize with the modern movement toward socialism. The largest contributions for this church come from persons who are either Socialists or sympathetic toward the movement. If these were taken out of the church, it could not maintain its existence even with the aid of the A. U. A.

Greeley is one of the three self-supporting churches in this department. Its minister, Rev. M. R. Kerr, is an outspoken Socialist and active in the party in that city. But the most generous supporters in that church—one of them, the mayor of the city—while not nominally Socialists, are cordial in their support of Mr. Kerr.

These conditions, of course, are purely local. The sentiment against Socialism in some of our churches—especially on the part of people who haven't the faintest idea of what it means—is strong. And yet, the preaching in most of the pulpits of this department is becoming increasingly colored by the deepening social conscience and the pressing social problems.

Is it not significant that the Episcopal Bishop of Utah, Mr. Spaulding, is an outspoken Socialist? Two years ago his Lenten lectures were devoted to that subject, and he frankly declared his belief in Marxian socialism. He has spoken in almost every town and city in the State under the auspices of the Socialist Party of the State. And no minister in the State is so universally respected and loved as he.

The Rocky Mountain States are distinctly missionary ground for liberal religion. Seven of the eleven organized Unitarian churches receive aid from the A. U. A. Without it they could not go on. But there is no way in which these western churches can so well show their appreciation of this help or deserve it, as by bravely facing the problem of today, as Channing and Parker and Emerson faced the problems of their time, and by blazing new trails of moral and spiritual expression and service for the coming generation to follow. The social gospel is the gospel for this age. It is the logic of religious liberalism. It is the only missionary substitute we can offer for orthodox's worn-out slogan: "The world for Christ." Here is the chance to make the "kingdom of God on earth" mean something to all sorts and conditions of men. Here is the chance to enlist the enthusiasm and arouse the heroism of the nation's young manhood and womanhood—and the only chance, too. Here is the chance to give concrete meaning and value to our formulas of faith. Here is the chance—the invitation, the challenge—to repudiate that moral dualism which calls some things "sacred" and others "secular", by insisting that nothing can be made sacred unless all is

made so—made to seem so, too, to the least and lowest in human society. A church that contents itself with serving the personal interests of its immediate membership and does not give itself heartily to the moral leavening of society with new social visions and ideals, is recreant to its supreme obligation—to the one thing which can make an agency of religion—and profanes the name of Jesus by pretending to revere him. "Now is the axe laid at the root of the tree." The bearers of this all-inclusive message of religion cannot be dissuaded from their world-task by the temporizing counsel of any one. Religion is no more our creation than life is. It can no more be modified to suit individual tastes than science can be made to fit the theories of biased men. The time is here for a great forward movement on the part of liberals —constructive,certainly, but courageous, insistent, compelling. What time so fitting as this centenary year of the birth of that valiant knight of the spirit, Theodore Parker? If Jesus is our leader, we shall make use of him as a leader, not as any sort of shibboleth. Above all, we shall know that religion means movement forward and upward toward the moral conquest of all that concerns life.

Unitarian Hymn-Writers

II. "The Book of Sams" and Its Editors, Samuel Longfellow and Samuel Johnson

TWO young Divinity students at the Harvard School in 1846 became possessed with a revolutionary idea. Harvard Divinity School in those days had more students than in these later times; and many sorts of men were brought in close contact of school companionship. Just at the time we write of some unusually promising young men were gathered there: Thomas Wentworth Higginson, O. B. Frothingham, William R. Alger, Joseph Henry Allen, Grindell Reynolds, and J. F. Moors, amongst others. These names alone indicate some diversity in range of thought and personality, and we suspect that they tell but part of the story. Transcendentalism was very much in the air, the bogie-man of some cautious minded Unitarians of the day—the flaming fire of advanced thought to others. Emerson's "Divinity School Address" with its electrifying charge of heresy had been preached but a few years before; Theodore Parker was just becoming an issue in Boston. The mischief of the German "Higher Criticism" was just creeping into American scholarship, and amongst the fledging theologians of Harvard Divinity School, issues of "conservatism" and "radicalism" were becoming interestingly intense.

The two young men we speak of shared a common impulse of heresy, and a common Christian name:—though one of them at least was reluctant to acknowledge that there was anything "Christian" about him. That was not Samuel Longfellow, the elder of the two, however:—but Samuel Johnson, his warmest friend, and sharer with him of the revolutionary idea.

The revolutionary idea was that people in Unitarian churches ought to mean what they sing, and sing to the measure of their best and most honest faith, when they sing at all, and that the hymn-books then in use in liberal churches did not make it possible to do either. Therefore they undertook, with the courage—and omniscience—of youth to make a book that would meet the situation: and so in 1846 was published the little volume of Hymns which Theodore Parker humorously styled "The Book of Sams" and which fixes a date of marked significance in the development of Unitarian hymnology.

Let us note for a moment the personal-

ity of the two rash young men who attempted before ordination to decide what Unitarian congregations ought to sing.

Samuel Longfellow was the brother of the great poet, Henry Wardsworth Longfellow, with whom he always lived in closest and choicest intimacy of spirit. Born in Portland in 1819 at the Longfellow homestead, he had his early religious training in the historic First Parish church, whose picturesque old building is still a noble landmark in that beautiful city and the tradition of whose pulpit has always been high and dignified. His father had been a classmate of Channing at Harvard, and is on record as having been chief mover in the modifying of the covenant of the old church in the direction of progress. His mother was a descendant of John Alden and Priscilla, whose romance was so beautifully woven into poetry by his older brother.

Samuel speaks of himself as having been a "dreamy child," fond of long walks through the woods, and a sensitive lover of nature. He was always, too, a book-lover, and stood high in all his studies: "He was easily our best writer", says a college classmate of him, and he always excelled in the charm of his literary style. He liked a few friends, but was chary of much society; partly perhaps because always of delicate health. When he was graduated from college his choice of profession was not immediate, and he taught a year or more at a home school near Baltimore, while making up his mind. Finally drawn to the ministry, he was not sure that Divinity school was the best place of preparation. His classmate Edward Everett Hale was very sure that it was not: and we find Longfellow writing to him, one day: "I was amused at your unchanged hostility to the Divinity School, as manifested in the appellation of 'monastic order', though, to be sure, that is an improvement on "Orthopedic Infirmary." But the influence of Hale did not settle the matter, evidently, for in 1846 we find him at the School beginning that deep and lasting friendship with Johnson which found its fitting symbol of grace in this "Book of Sams."

The "second Samuel" was born in Salem, Mass., in 1822 and was graduated from Harvard College in 1842. Unlike Longfellow, he seemed to have had no hesitancy about his life vocation but entered immediately upon his preparation for the ministry at the Divinity School.

Evidently Johnson was the more aggressively radical of the two men, and perhaps influenced not a little the ripening heresies of his friend. Dr. Joseph May, whose delightful memoir of Samuel Longfellow is the chief source of our information presents this graphic contrast of the temperaments of the two men:

"While Longfellow was calm, meditative and debonair, social in disposition and desultory in his habits of thought and study, his friend was austere, strenuous, systematic, and of tireless industry. An extreme individualist, Johnson's habits were naturally recluse. In dealing with debated questions he was dogmatic and aggressive. He shared with Longfellow a highly poetic nature, and his poems while fewer were even of higher artistic quality and grander strain. The two friends were at one in the spirituality of their habitual thought and their vivid apprehension of the facts and relations of the spiritual world. With Johnson, however, while his intuitions of divine things were perhaps loftier and more intense, they were rather by the avenue of the intellect. To Longfellow these verities were known by that direct cognizance which is as spiritual vision. The latter was of much wider and warmer personal sympathies: more patient of opposition and of the slow response of their age to the truths with which they both yearned to enlighten and enfranchise it."

Such were the young men who in 1846 issued that little "Book of Hymns" which embodied to them a principle of honesty in worship. It was but a small volume, prefaced by some well-selected passages of scripture arranged for alternate reading in public service. The hymns, were published without tunes

after the custom of the time, and classified in a very rational manner. To the modern reader the book does not seem very "advanced;" some lines are in it which would have no place in a modern book of liberal worship. But it was intended to be consistently and distinctively progressive; and great pains were taken by its editors to make it thorough-going. They read, criticised and compared thousands of hymns, hunting out the fugitive lyrics of newspapers and periodicals, ransacking the hymn-collection of all churches and denominations, searching through the writings of other peoples and tongues ancient and modern, and drawing freely from the productions of the great poets by skillful adaptations and excerpts. They wrote to the liberal poets of their time for contributions with the delightful courage of youth; "O Thou Great Friend" was Parker's contribution, and from Emerson, Very, Lowell, H. W. Longfellow, Sears, Furness, Clarke, and Mrs. Stowe came hymns which if not entirely new, were fresh and recent, and here brought together as hymns for the first time. From Whittier in particular they adapted for the first time much valuable hymn-stuff, a large number of the hymns now common in later collections being first used in this way in this collection. Mrs. Adam's "Nearer My God to Thee" had here its first American appearance and it is interesting to note that Newman's great hymn, "Lead Kindly Light" was discovered in a newspaper marked "anonymous," and was so published in this hymn-book. It has to be confessed that the young editors took great liberties with their hymn-selections "for conscience sake," and some mutilations were hardly pardonable. But on the whole the work was done with much sanity of judgment as well as rare good taste.

How was this "young men's" venture received? At any rate it was not damned with inattention. Its success was indeed most gratifying: and even its criticism chiefly amusing. An edition of five hundred was taken within four months: the first church to adopt it was the recently organized "Church of the Unity" in Worcester, whose pastor was Edward Everett Hale. We can imagine how it came about! Theodore Parker's Boston congregation was the second to adopt it, with his hearty endorsement. "Theodore Parker liked the book" writes Longfellow, "because he recognized, more than was usual in the Unitarian Hymn books the idea that there *is* a Holy Spirit; and that God is really present with and *in* the soul of man, a doctrine which Unitarians then looked upon as somewhat fanatical."

Very naturally, the chief criticisms of the book were for the things left out. "The best thing (a critic) could have done for us, Sam"; runs a letter from the First Samuel to the Second Samuel in the eager days of the first triumphs; "if people will look up those hymns and think *why* we left them out. Our book needs to be compared with others to make its higher tone distinctly visible. If they will but notice, in praise or blame, its humanity." "Remorse for Sin," we find in another letter "was not there, and was not meant to be. Not that it is not a real, sometimes terribly real, state of soul: but surely not a healthy one, and surely too a most private and individual one, and out of place in public worship". These are indications amongst many, that a fine seriousness of motive was wedded with the enthusiasm of two thoroughly poetic souls in bringing this little book into being.

Seventeen years later these two friends now ripened somewhat and enriched with the experiences of a decade of active pastoral service shared together a congenial holiday of foreign travel, and spent one month of this, "a rainy month in Nice" in entirely recasting the hymn-book, adding much, leaving not a little out, and changing the order entirely to make the volume published as "Hymns of the Spirit." The main motive of change was doctrinal. Longfellow especially had modified his views of many things considerably becoming more radical and individualistic in his views, while Johnson, always of the advance line in heresy, had become acutely dissatisfied with the earlier collection because of some of the things put in. Even

before the second edition of the first book was issued he wrote that he was dismayed to find at least sixty hymns in it which he could not conscientiously use. All elements of the supernatural especially in the nature of Jesus, were eliminated, and Johnson was peculiarly sensitive to hymns emphatic of the unique standing of Christian institutions, or of Christianity as an institution itself. Some of the sacrifices of good material thus necessitated may seem to us unwarranted; but on the whole, it stands as a peculiarly noble collection of "Hymns of the Spirit" indeed: and had the austerity of its ideal of "honesty in worship" persevered in later days we should be farther advanced in the evolution of a worthier "Liberal Hymn-book" than has yet appeared. It is interesting to note, however, how large a part of this book of fifty years ago stands as the staple substance of our later books.

But chief of interest perhaps in the "Hymns of the Spirit" is its collection of hymns by the two men whose hands selected the whole, but enriched the whole by the lyric tone of their own inspiration. Twenty hymns are ascribed to Samuel Longfellow: and about half as many to Johnson, while others entered as "anonymous" are the production of one or the other. And were the rest of the book ill-sorted and cumulately worthless these two score hymns would make it of priceless worth.

Of the twenty hymns contributed by Longfellow to the "Hymns of the Spirit" ten have become a part of the permanent inspiration of our churches, appearing in nearly every modern collection and more than that, continuing in actual use in our churches. Indeed five of them are among our very most familiar hymns,—none perhaps more frequently sung by our congregations. "One holy church of God appears" is pre-eminently our great missionary hymn—not because of any narrow sectarian note, but because it distinctly sounds our note of insistent comprehensiveness of gospel. "God of ages and of nations," still more triumphantly universal in its spirit is almost as familiar; "Go forth to life O child of Earth," written when at Divinity School, is a beautiful call for virile consecration, while two vesper hymns "Again as evening shadows falls," and "Now on land and sea descending" are classic for evening worship. It is interesting here to note that a significant contribution of Samuel Longfellow to the traditions of our churches was the establishment of the custom of vesper (afternoon) services, to be largely musical, in place of the old-fashioned evening services, at his church in Brooklyn. For these services he prepared a book of "Vesper Services" containing musical responses of the choir to versicles read by the minister, besides a rich collection of hymns appropriate to the late afternoon hour, among which these two hymns first appeared. This book of services was largely used among our congregations for two decades at least, and well-worn copies may still be found in the choir lofts of many of our older churches.

With these more familiar hymns of general worship must be placed one which has probably been used in more Ordination services than any other ever written, and for generations still to come will be so used: "O God thy children gathered here." It is interesting to know that this was prepared for his friend Johnson, before he had received a call! These five hymns beyond all doubt will remain immortal in our churches,—aye, become a part of the lyric-treasures of the "Church Universal" which shall some day absorb our liberal movement in a larger household of faith.

Not quite so familiar as these, yet still in frequent use, are five other hymns of Longfellow's; two beautiful lyrics of reverence for the tradition of Jesus: "The loving Friend of all who bowed"—and "A Voice by Jordan's shore" both included in nearly every recent hymn collection of the liberal faith. "Love for all, and can it be" touches a tenderer, more intimate and personal note than any of the others perhaps: "Holy Spirit, Truth divine" is often included in recent collections, and often sung, but has not the direct inspiration or richness of originality which mark the others.

"Beneath the shadow of the cross" is also a hymn that still continues in use.

Of the more unfamiliar hymns of Longfellow, in this collection perhaps the noblest is the one prepared for "Reform meetings:" surely not out of date and most surely rich in a suggestiveness and vividness of inspiration not unheeded to-day. We reproduce it in another place.

The predominant characteristic of Longfellow's hymns as we believe, is their splendid genuineness. There is little of conventional piety, or thinly running unction. Very simple and direct in diction, always, and with a musical smoothness of phrase which never lapses into vacuity of thought, there is always a strong, fresh, incisive theme of aspiration and ideal which rings true, and has vital uplift. There are places where Johnson's thought is loftier, and his passion more intense, and his ideal more subtle; but it must be confessed that the younger man lacked at once the directness, and whole-souled genuineness of Longfellow. His intellectualism is more in evidence,often as a fettering element: and although more of a radical than Longfellow, his phraseology is often more conventional and less spontaneous and modern. Only half as many hymns are ascribed to him as to Longfellow: some of these are the very noblest in the collection: and yet it is obvious that his lesser contribution was not due to more scrupulous painstaking, and so less eager prodigality in production. More of his hymns are marred by metric infelicities, and unspontaneous diction: more have dull lines and phrases that seem forced: and almost none are so simple, direct and universal as Longfellow's.

And yet out of Johnson's ten, five are to be found in almost every recent collection, and three are among our classics. "City of God, how broad and far," belongs always as we find it in"Hymns of the Spirit" side by side with Longfellow's "One holy church of God." To our minds it is the nobler of the two. "Life of Ages richly poured" is quite as familiar and almost as exalted. "Father, in thy mysterious presence kneeling" is one of the rare hymns of profound feeling which must always stand as high-water marks of modern spirituality. "God of the earnest heart" prepared by Johnson for a graduating hymn of his Divinity School class is full of the pulse of virile consecration, and "Onward, onward, though the region" is resolute with the tone of brave endeavor. It is notable however that both this hymn and the great "Life of Ages richly poured," have to be pruned of some stanzas before found acceptable for modern collections, not simply because of undue length but, (and this is particularly true of the greater) because the redundant stanzas are over-intellectual and complex in thought, and do not *sing* well. This fate never befalls the hymns of Longfellow. A noble lyric of tribute to Jesus is one beginning "Strong-souled Reformer, whose far-seeing faith," but this is really more a lyric than a hymn, and the same is even more true of one addressed to Paul, which is not properly a hymn at all, but yet an exalted gem of poetry.

It remains only to say a word or so regarding the later career of these two strong-hearted friends. Longfellow's life was always handicapped by ill-health, yet his service in the active ministry by no means failed. After leaving Divinity school he seems to have been a "good candidate," receiving calls to West Cambridge and Newburyport, before accepting a call to Fall River. Here he put in four years of faithful and not uncongenial labor: yet it was obvious that there was not his fitting place of service: and in 1851 he resigned. Not long afterward, the Second Church in Brooklyn (in more recent years "John Chadwick's church") then just organizing called him to its work, and he gladly entered into its ministry. To tell the truth he was never inclined to be much of a denominationalist, and it was not his fault perhaps that this church did not cut loose entirely from Unitarian affiliations and stand as a Free Church. Those familiar with our denominational history of

about that time, however, and particularly some local aspects of it, may understand this frame of mind better than those who know our Unitarian movement in its more recent activities. The Free Religious Society was soon to emerge into activity, and although Mr. Longfellow never formally identified himself with that movement some of his warmest friends and earlier school-mates, as Johnson, Frothingham, Higginson, Weis,and Very were much possessed with the"Free Religious" idea.

In later years Mr. Longfellow was persuaded to assume the pastorate of the church in Germantown, where he was very much loved. Never married, he was always peculiarly a friend of children, a sympathetic if not an aggressively active pastor, and a man honored in the community of which he was a part. When his brother Henry Wardsworth died, it seemed to him the noblest and holiest work to which he could devote himself to prepare a worthy biography of the great poet and to that work he devoted himself in his later years. He died in 1892.

Of Samuel Johnson we can, in the space that remains, speak only in meagre terms.

His radical position as regards the institutional value of Christianity made it difficult for him to find a congenial place of service and it was not until 1853 that he entered into active pastoral work,and then not in the "denominational family" but as pastor of a "Free Church" in Lynn, Mass., where his peculiar ideas had free scope. He ministered here until 1870, when he retired to devote himself to literary work, especially along the lines of his studies in Oriental religions. His published volumes on "Orental Religions" are masterly in their range of erudition and grasp of essential factors. The last years of his life were spent in North Andover where he died in 1883.

The Relation of the Church to the Social Injustice of the Time

By REV. HOWARD C. IVES, Minister of All Souls' Church, New London, Conn.

WHAT is the relation of the church to the social injustice of the time?

This whole question hinges upon the definition of Christianity. By the Church is meant the Christian Church By the Christian Church is meant a body of men and women who profess themselves believers in and followers of Jesus of Nazareth. What then should be the relation between an organized body of people who profess themselves followers of Jesus,—and Injustice? for injustice is always social.

Plainly the relation should be just that which Jesus bore towards the injustice of his time.

Now what was that relation? Without question it was that of unqualified opposition, with a clear distinction between hatred of the sin and love of the sinner. This attitude was founded on his fundamental law "Thou shalt love God with all thy heart, soul, mind and strength, and thy neighbor as thyself." Which I take to mean "Thou shalt love Righteousness, Justice and Truth with all the energy of thy being, but thou shalt never forget that this love can only find expression in love to your brother man through whom, and only so, righteousness, justice and truth find social expression. I take Jesus to say, not only in words, not only in countless parables and illustrations, but in every detail of of his life and death, that love to God means nothing more nor less than love to man, and that love towards man is

only compatible with energetic devotion of our whole being to his highest interests and happiness and that these are based eternally on character. This is why he said the second commandment is like the first; why, later in his teaching he said "A new commandment I give unto you that ye love one another as I have loved you," without mentioning love towards God, taking it for granted as it were, what the Epistle of John clearly states, that a man cannot possibly love God whom he hath not seen unless he first loves man whom he hath seen.

Furthermore we see that it necessarily follows from this fundamental position that love towards man implies hatred of all unrighteousness, injustice and lies among men, for these work evil results individually and socially, and to countenance them, to be silent in face of them, to participate in them in the slightest degree, or to profit by them, is to act contrary to your brother's highest interests, is practically to show hatred toward him, and so to break the fundamental law of Christianity. We see clearly now,what Jesus intuitively saw, that a house of prayer and a den of thieves cannot possibly occupy the same place, and that to allow the attempt to be made through a mistaken gentleness and superficial kindness is really acting contrary to even the thieves best interests, and a brutal disregard of the rights and happiness of society at large, is, in a word, to show hatred not love towards man.

The ideal object for which the church of Christ exists,whether it is consciously aware of it or not; the object to attain which it asks the consideration and support of the world,whether the world specifically conceives it as such or not, is the establishment of the Kingdom of God on earth. By this I mean what I think Jesus meant, the establishment of such a system of government and of social habits as shall be in line with the ways and laws written deep in the very structure of the physical and spiritual universe. Men are consciously and determinedly to be fellow-workers with God in making the still more or less chaotic physical world into a cosmos; in making the soul of man more and more like the soul of the Father of all souls; and less like the instinct of the beast and to make out of the warring factions and selfish individualistic elements which now make up society an altruistic Family of God, a Democracy of the Soul, governed from within by those sublime principles of Righteousness, Justice and Love which Jesus, and all the great souls of history, have shown to be the only foundation upon which it is possible to rear a social system which shall make for the prosperity and happiness and peace of all.

Judging from results, and taking a long look over cosmic history, this is the goal towards which the universe has been moving since fire mist first started on its planetary way. When first "a sense of law and beauty, and a face turned from the sod," developed it was only this evolution taking a next step. The great religions of the world have obtained their hold on the hearts of men, and swayed the destinies of nations, in proportion as these great principles have been the heart of their teaching. Slowly through the long ages men have learned by grim experience that selfishness and hate is the road to death, and that unselfish love, brotherly consideration between man and his brother man, is the way of life, the way to more and more abundant life, the way to the establishment of God's Kingdom on earth.

The great prophet of the soul, the man who staked his life on the truth of this beautiful proposition and in losing his life gained the whole world over to the truth of it, is Jesus of Nazareth. The church was founded on the teachings of this prophet and their illustrations in his divinely-human life and death. But from the very first the fundamental basis of the Golden Rule has been more or less befogged and confused by extraneous, superficial and superstitious overlayings and trappings. But there have always been devoted souls who saw through these superficialities and superstitions to the soul within. Such were Francis of Assizi, Martin Luther, John Wesley, Henry Ward Beecher, Phillips

Brooks and countless others. These in spite of creed and dogma, not because of them, believed that love would conquer the world.

This minority have made up the army of the church militant. From Paul writing from a prison that "though one understands all mysteries and all knowledge and have not Love he is nothing" to Lincoln feeling unable to join any church because there was none basing all its claim to authority on the Golden Rule, the world has turned its face to that conception of Christianity. Yet it has never lacked its prophets and they have been willing to be burned and flogged and killed; to be stoned in Boston streets, like Sumner and Garrison, for the faith that was in them, while the great organized church had its gaze fixed on some other-worldly bliss, some selfish earthly monarchy, some intellectual accuracy of statement or the damning of wickedness that happened three thousand years ago.

But to those who look at passing history with a seeing eye it is plain that we have entered upon a new era. From Luther to Channing there has been a succession of victories for the cause of spiritual freedom. Since Channing, however, earnest souls of all sects, religions and nations have come to see that freedom is only valuable as it is brought into subjection to a higher law. The fight is no longer for freedom, but a tremendous fight is on to make that freedom not only intellectual but practical, democratic, social. A new meaning is given to the great message of Amos. We seem to hear rolling through the great modern world of commerce, industry, government and social life a sublime and awful voice that speaks in the roar of every mill, and the pitiful picking in every mine; that peals from every cannon's mouth and whispers in every sob of little children; that thunders in every law framed to strengthen the strong and weaken the weak, and inscribes itself in every trade agreement of the captains of industry. Listen and we may hear it. "I am the Lord, and all souls are mine. What care I for your many and various sacrifices and assemblies, and your freedom to follow your own pleasure in formal worship before me? Dost thou think that I am altogether such an one as thyself to be pleased with incense that smells of thy brother's blood, or with hymns that are mingled with his agonized cries? Wash you, make you clean, let justice roll down as waters and righteousness as a mighty stream. Is not this the worship that I have chosen that thou deal thy bread to the hungry; and the poor that are cast out thou shalt take, not to the alms house but to thine own home?" And then we hear another voice, greater than that of Amos, but speaking with the same high authority: "If thou shalt bring thy gift to my altar, saith the Lord, and there remember that thy brother hath aught against thee, leave there thy gift before the altar and go thy way: first be reconciled to thy brother and then come and offer thy gift." O ye churches of Christ built by the strong and great of the earth, whose altars are decked with all the gifts that money can buy, hath not thy brother aught against thee? Listen to the wail rising from the thousands of children in the shops of New England. Listen to the heart-broken sobs of little girls stolen and chained in dungeons to minister to the lusts of their big and brutal brothers. "I will have none of your gifts and churches," saith the Lord "until ye shall be reconciled to thy brother man."

Now there is a large majority of the members and leaders of the Christian church organization which loudly deprecates such an outspoken, uncompromising attitude as this. "You weaken our influence, which on the whole is good, by such attacks" they say. "Our fundamental message is practically yours: we too believe in the Golden Rule, the Sermon on the Mount, the absolute prerequisite of personal and social righteousness, justice and love before any worship can be acceptable to God. But we also believe in the historic church; in the beauty of formal worship with psalms and hymns, public prayer and sermons inculcating the very laws you are laying down. But you go too fast, you demand too much, you are too arbitrary

and wholesale in your denunciations of the shortcomings of the historic church."

My answer is simply that I too believe in and love the historic church. I too believe in and love all that I have grown up with in the form of social meeting of men and women to worship the God of our fathers in ways of beauty and emotion.

But I have come to see that these derive their only value from the unselfish heart that worships; I have come to see that pews filled with singing and listening men and women is not a church of Christ unless those men and women come from a daily round vitalized and inspired with ideals and deeds like those of the Good Samaritan, and the Good Shepherd and the Great Physician. I believe Jesus meant what he said that only "The pure in heart see God," and when he left his final commandment "Ye shall love one another as I have loved you."

As to the objection that we weaken the good influence of the church by outspoken denunciation of its recreancy should be sufficient to point out that it was for the "safety" of the historic Jewish church that Jesus was crucified; it was to "save" the Roman church that Luther was excommunicated; it was to "save" the theology of Calvin that Servetus was burned; it was to "save" the influence of the English church that Bunyan and Fox were persecuted and the Puritans driven to a new world; it was to "save" the grim theology of New England that the witches were burned; it was to "save" the feelings of their people that the ministers for twenty years before the civil war refused to stand openly on the side of the slave.

And now the same reason is given why the church should be careful not to weaken her influence for good by acknowledging her sins. Yet look back over history. It was Jesus who won, though on the cross; it was Luther who won though alone against emperors and pope,against prelates and armies and the established church throughout the world. It was Servetus, Bunyan, Fox, and the slave who won. And why? Simply because theirs was the righteous, and just cause and it always wins, though the name of the Most High God be sacriligeously invoked to support unrighteousness and injustice.

What then shall be the attitude of the modern church towards the social injustice of our time? That of uncompromising war. Otherwise we have no right to name the name of Christ who gave his life for the poor, the weak, the sinful of the world. He loved the sinner but he loved him too well to belittle his sin. So the church should say, and is saying, thank God, that we love our country too well to see her treading the way of death and raise no warning voice We love our sinning brother too well to cry peace, peace when there is no peace and welcome him to the pews with soft platitudes while his hand is even now red with his brother's blood, and his pockets swollen with the price of their infamy. We love the church too well to countenance her silence in the face of awful unrighteousness and injustice. But above all we love our oppressed, struggling, starving brother; our hopeless, stained, despairing sister; our toiling, sunless, playless, hopeless little ones too much to rest silent, and hold the garments of their stoners, so long as there is a possibility of remonstrance availing, or salvation in an outstretched arm and uplifting hand.

Our Unitarian Opportunity

By JAS. G. TOWNSEND, D. D.

It may be that I misjudge, but I think there is in many of our ministers an indolent agnosticism, a feeling that, to the great questions the human soul is asking there is no answer, and there *can* be no answer. And as a result of this agnosticism, with a few exceptions among which I place Pres. Eliot's "New Religion", Dr. Doan's idea of "The Humanism of God," and Prof. James' "Pluralistic Universe," original intellectual work is no longer attempted among us. The feeling is that upon the great ideas of God, freedom, immortality, even of evolution all the great thoughts have been uttered. We are leaning too much on our noble past, and forget

that our Channingism, nay even our Parkerism is narrow and unscientific, and that there never was greater need than now for a broader, clearer statement of the great truths of Religion, in other words, a new conception of the universe.

To be more explicit, I think our Unitarianism is too largely an apology, too much of a softening of the "old theology" too much of the leadership of Jesus, while men in every condition of life are asking for an answer to the great problems of life. And this deep intellectual and moral hunger is an evidence that we are coming to a new era in religion.

And we ministers of the Unitarian church, having the birthright of intellectual freedom, ought to recognize this intellectual hunger. Here is our opportunity.

I go out at night and look up at the planet Jupiter, that brightest flower in the meadow of the sky, with sad and wondering eyes. I ask is life there? Are there tears, and toil and graves there? I look upon our own earth and see sorrows, tragedies, graves, and I ask is the only answer found in the words of Jesus, great words, but words so often mingled with childish superstitions?

What answer does Unitarianism give? "Trust your instincts, your higher spiritual instincts." But is there no other answer? Is there not possible a new and truer conception of God, of man, of duty? Do these great themes lie outside the realm of sound thinking? And is not sound, clear, brave thinking the great need of to-day? Is not the present a time for vast and transcendent beginnings?

Future American and the Country Town

New York Unitarian Club's Third Dinner

DIVERSITY of interest and persistency in getting at interesting facts is obviously the order of things with the Unitarian Club of New York. The third dinner of the season was held at the sumptuous Hotel Manhattan and well-living Unitarians at the cost of two dollars and a half, each, ate a substantial dinner before considering together the ways folks live on New England farms, and some of the industrial issues of the Future American.

President Cyril H. Burdett was surely happy; the program turned out well: the attendance was gratifying, the dinner good and Mr. Burdett's own remarks felicitous and clever. The Unitarian Club is to be congratulated on the efficiency and abundant optimism of its energetic president.

The first speaker of the evening was Rev. Joseph N. Pardee "a country parson", as he styled himself; minister of the venerable and honored church in Bolton, Mass., which, may we casually remark, is in the heart of one of the most beautiful and intelligent farming populations in New England, Worcester County, Massachusetts.

Mr. Pardee made a very pleasing address, simple, practical, at times touched with wit, and always with robust common sense. The substance of his address is as follows:

Fellow Unitarians:

I came very near saying "Mr. Moderator," and of course you who are from New England realize how easy it is for a countryman from New England to make that mistake.

I will deal to-night especially with the economic foundations, the facts on which our country life is based. For a beginning it is necessary to have a definition of what is a country town. Men have tried to fix the limit by a certain number of the population but I think a community is a country town whose life is based on the single industry of agriculture. If you introduce any other industry you introduce economics which change the

whole social aspect of the country. I take the New England towns as examples for I know the NewEngland towns better than others but my observations on journeys through the middle West lead me to say that with slight modifications what I say of New England will apply to rural New York and the Middle West. Conditions vary with the character of the country itself, the soil, the nearness of large manufacturing plants. All these things modify the character. Rhode Island for that reason can hardly be said to have any rural section.

Previous to the Civil War no line of demarkation was visible between the small town and the rural district. About the time of the War the manufacturing works made a concentration of population. Then came the decline of agriculture. Now the tide is slowly turning. For a long time the best of the strong young blood has been drawn away leaving the weak and poor and debased behind. It has been said that "you cannot keep skimming the pan and have equally good milk." But the New England towns keep on milking and even after skimming there is left good strong blood-making, bone-breeding *milk*, and everyone knows that cream is a luxury. It is true that the rural towns have lost the men of great calibre,—the best offices in the city are filled with men from the country, lawyers, etc. But the city offers attractions for the debased and evil, and the slums as well as the offices have been recruited from the country. The rowdy element has departed from the rural life. The population that remains is made up largely of the old stock, although it is true that immigrants in large numbers are taking up farms.

Some other facts are equally significant. It has been taken for granted that the rural towns are deficient in young blood. As a matter of fact there are a great number of young people in the country. One very significant difference between rural and city life is that there are more men in the country. The city offers more attractive employments to girls and women. A very significant difference between country and city is the striking disproportion between the married and unmarried. Single blessedness seems to thrive best in scenes of hurry and bustle while rural loneliness seems to turn the mind toward matrimony.

There are cases of moral and physical degeneracy in the rural communities but I presume there are in New York too. Intemperance exists but is decreasing. Profanity is also decreasing. From long personal observation, and most men of sixty years of age living in the country agree with me, conditions of physical and moral health are vastly better than forty years ago.

The rapidly developing West meant ruin to the farms if they did not revolutionize their methods. The average farmer is a man attentive to the conditions around him and alert to profit by them. It means something when half the population have more wealth than all the people had fifty years ago. For some reason there seems to be an impression that eastern farmers have less than the average business man's good sense. The average farmer is quite as well informed as to what is going on in the world as the men engaged in the industry of the city. The farm journals devote some of their space to current events, art, literature, etc. The average farmer does not entirely neglect the technical journals that come to his table,—the agriculture magazines. It is an exceptional farmer towhom one or more of these papers do not come. The expert from colleges, when lecturing to the farmers, know that he has an audience that is not to be talked down to.

The truth is, farming of any kind depends largely upon the character of the man; but there are other influences at work. Every civilized country has been undergoing an agricultural depression. Near the cities the tendency is toward smaller farms. High priced land must be tilled by low priced labor. Low priced land can be tilled by high priced labor. It is not so much a matter of getting men to work them but a purely economical question: can men find as good a living on farms as they can in the trades. Few people are contented with their lot. Those in the country want to get into the cities. The city people would like to get back to the farms. But if a balance were struck the country would come out ahead.

There is no business that requires a larger capital in proportion to the output than the business of farming. 84 per cent. of farming capital is fixed capital. Working capital is seldom turned over more than once a year.

The whole question is economic. The whole movement from the country to the city is economic. The movement back again

is economic. The drift is now back to the country. The farmers are getting as much out of their life as any people. The greatest problem the farmers wrestle with to-day is the labor problem. There are great many other changes that have taken place. Their life has been greatly improved. Country schools have been revolutionized in the last dozen years. Social forces, as the women's clubs, the grange and telephones, have great influence. The steadily increasing numbers of young men going from the farms to agricultural colleges and back to the land is significant. The great majority of country pastors are optimistic. The country folks are the most efficient people when they see the need and have the means of doing. You cannot do things for country people. You can only teach them to do things for themselves. The summer resident has done much to soften the manners and widen the range of vision of the country youth.

The second speaker of the evening was Pres. Jacob G. Shurman of Cornell University. Dr. Schurman was received with cordial enthusiasm and spoke with ringing eloquence and good sense. While it is impossible to do justice to his address in this hasty review, we are able to reproduce some of the good things that he said.

President Schurman began with a graceful tribute to the speaker who preceded him.

I have been immensely interested, he said, in the paper to which we have listened and I have within my own experience to confirm the optimism that results. The other day I heard two students (Art and Science) talking together and one of them said, "I think the best place to start life is on one of these farms in New York State and if I had some money I would buy one and start in."

A farmer gets a house for himself and family, all the food raised for himself and family. And he is able to pay a fair wage to the members of his family who do work on his farm. He gets 5 per cent on all his money invested and finally he has over and above these expenses $981. This is on a capital of from ten to eleven thousand on an average.

We need for a republic this great middle class who have neither poverty nor great riches but enough, and the democratic affection and character and the patriotism.

The future American we can only think of in the terms of the civilization about us. The most we can wish of the future American is that he shall be highly civilized. "We imagine", says Emerson, "that our civilization is at its meridian. The fact is we have not got beyond the cock-crowing hour of the morning". When we speak of the future American what we hope and mean is that we may be in advance of this morning star toward noonday splendor. We hope that the future American may escape the condemnation of Emerson and I don't see why he should not. We have some advantages over some nations of the world. We have a great domain; no other country has such a domain and that fact ought to affect our thought. The natural geography of America ought to be a force for pushing on toward higher civilization. America is a crucible for the mixing of the nations. In any great civilizing period of history, England in the Norman conquest, Greece, we find behind it a mixing of different nations. That is going on here. Take for instance the German influence. They sought from the time they came here first the best land for their farms. With their industry and intelligence they have made the best farmers in the country. They have supplied technical schools and taught the country the need of technical schools. The kindergarten at one end and the university at the other come from the German. What a power they have been in politics . They have helped defend the country and to elevate it. They have almost created American music. Take out of American civilization what the German element has put into it and what a mere practical civilization would be left! Your denomination has felt the influence. You have welcomed the thought of the German philosophers' Biblical criticism. If this sort of thing has happened in the case of the German to our civilization it seems to me it is happening with every nation that mixes with our native stock.

I know well enough that no circumstances or outside agencies will make men civilized any more than it will make them moral or religious. It must come from themselves.

The highest culture involves a high reason and noble ideas and ideals and we can't claim that we have these. We have shared all we have with the mass of the people. We have determined that in this vast domain everybody shall have an opportunity to enjoy these good

things. A Frenchman has said "You make science popular, Metaphysics intelligible and vice respectable."

We are so determined that the mass of our people shall enjoy all the good that there is a danger of lowering the level. An old lady said once (she was a strict Calvinist) "Those Universalists believe that everybody will be saved but we look for better things." That old lady had got hold of a genuine thought. Heaven wouldn't be Heaven where all people were mixed. There are everlasting distinctions and she saw it. I recognize that if our nation is to occupy the position that the highest nations have occupied we have to recognize the highest types.

There is a growing demand for moral reform and justice. Justice in the state, justice in society. What is it? The Socialist has an easy answer. To him it is equality. Equal labor, equal property. There must be an element of inequality as well as justice in this world. We can never get rid of the inequality in our nation of justice. There is one field where we can carry the idea of justice and even equality further than we have carried it.

It is a matter of taxation. We have been putting the burden of taxation upon the consumer. I am in favor of getting larger methods of justice in our system of taxation. That means that we should have two taxes upon us. One of income and one of succession inheritance—property which increases in value without any effort of the owner. I believe we shall not continue to use reasonably the wage earnings of this country until we introduce a system of taxation that will relieve the consumer and throw the burden on those that can afford it.

A State to survive must rest on justice. Plato says, "The state is justice writ large." If our civilization of the future is to be higher than our civilization of to-day, I believe it is the steadily improving development of our idealisms; that our successors will feel the truth of the great saying that man cannot live by bread alone but by *ideas* and *principles*.

At the conclusion of President Schurman's address, Mr. Burdett called upon Rev. John Haynes Holmes for a few words—and got something vehemently characteristic for a reply.

"For years," he said, "I have waited to hear what I have heard to-night, spoken as a Unitarian audience. The speaker has led us along lines we are all coming to."

We, as Americans, do not need culture as President Schurman thinks. Culture means a development at the price of the people. We would not want Grecian culture at the price of human slavery: we're having industrial slavery now—we want something better! We are determined that, when the goal is reached, we'll all get there together!

The problem we are facing to-day is, How can we apply Justice? We are facing an era of revolution!

Mr. Holmes traced the labor uprising in Philadelphia and those places. He said it meant that the government had broken down! We cannot apply an income tax—our Constitution is against it! There is no Democratic party, and the Republican party is rent in twain. Cooper Union tells what the people are thinking about.

"The fate of the people," said Mr. Holmes to his audience, "is in such hands as yours. Will you oppose justice to preserve your own fortunes? You'll have revolution if you do! You must sympathize with the aspirations of humanity. Revolutions are always caused by the upper classes."

Rev. Thomas R. Slicer was called up for the final word and spoke mainly in reply to Mr. Holmes.

"As to the future American," he said, "he must first of all be an American, the kind that was started long ago. I haven't much sympathy with America simply 'getting on.' My pulses are not beating as high as Mr. Holmes's. I'm not so young. That's not his fault nor mine. I am willing to wait and see what is going to happen. For something is surely going to happen. Socialism is often an ideal linked with an appetite, a dream of loot! Justice means better men, not so much better conditions. Not by economic conditions can we make better men. The reverse is true." It is dangerous to replace individualism by ignorant substitution—that means ruin. People should rejoice in trusts, but dislike conditions that produce them.

"What I'm anxious about is that men

should be given equal opportunity. I want what Mr. Holmes wants, but I want it to come another way."

Some Missionary Needs

In a vigorously expressed statement of the needs of the American Unitarian Association, and our missionary field, in a recent number of the Christian Register, President Samuel A. Eliot summarized some of the especial opportunities for rendering service to our cause by helping in specific causes as follows:

"I. $4,000 for the Building Fund for the new society at Morgantown, W. Va. The society has just secured an admirable lot, and its progress and stability now depend upon the building upon the lot of an adequate chapel or parish house. Morgantown is the seat of the State University. Our cause has taken good root and is ably led, but the building is essential to assure success.

"II. $2,000 to secure lots for the new college town churches at Brookings, S. D., and at Eugene, Ore. These are important fields of service, and the work so well begun must not be permitted to languish for want of a plant.

"III. $2,500 to complete two important enterprises likely to be left half done this year unless prompt aid can be given. The final payment on the purchase of the parsonage in Richmond, Va., must be made in April, and the society in Winnipeg, Man., still lacks a considerable sum in the price of its greatly needed lot.

"IV. $2,000 to testify to the appreciation of our fellowship of the pluck and patience of our friends in West Somerville, Mass. They have, after a long struggle, completed the purchase of the lot and now adopted plans for a simple, tasteful little church which ought to be built during the coming summer.

"V. $2,000 for the purchase of a lot for the society in Everett, Wash. The work there is at the stage when an investment in property is essential to the welfare of the church and the advance of our cause.

"VI. $2,500 to enable the directors to put a field agent at work in the great centres of population in Central and Southwestern Ohio. The flourishing cities of Dayton, Columbus, Springfield, and Urbana are within easy reach of each other and offer the most populous field of service in the country as yet unoccupied by the representatives of our cause

These six special and immediate opportunities represent all parts of the country and a considerable diversity of service. Friends who may be disposed to advance this work may either make their gifts for the single specific object that most enlists their sympathy, or they may subscribe to the general fund and leave it to the discretion of the directors to apply their contributions judiciously and efficiently."

A Hymn for the Living Church

O God, whose joy in eager souls
Thrills to a zest of holy might,
Whose will each earnest heart controls
That burns to battle for the right:

Give to thy living Church, today,
New Vision of Truth's stalwart Good:
New passion of Love's greatening way,
New pulse of human brotherhood!

The time is tense with holier call
Than ever age of past had known;
And flaming faith, o'er-reaching all
The old time's best, hath on us grown;

The time is thrilling with its dream
Of nobler custom, holier right:
On every eastern hill-top gleams
Prophetic glow of dawning light.

A hot impatience for all wrong,
And yearning faith that will not stay,
But leaps to service with a song—
Such are thy prophet-calls today.

A surging wrath at evils sore
That thwart the onward march of man:
A pulsing confidence, the more,
That justice is thy thwartless plan:

A daring zeal to share with Thee
The toiling strain of urging good:
Comrades with thine Eternity—
Thy children, Father, wait thy word!

O God, thy living Church doth wait
A Voice to lead Truth's hard, glad way—
Give thou the Prophet, ere too late,
The Prophet of this greatening day!

Mrs. Eliza Read Sunderland

MRS. Eliza R. Sunderland, wife of the Rev. J. T. Sunderland, who recently died at her home in Hartford, Conn., had so long been prominent not only among the Unitarian women of this country but in educational, literary and philanthropic circles outside of our communion, that a sketch of her life and of the large and many sided work which she had done seems fitting for the pages of THE UNITARIAN.

On the day following her death the *Hartford Post* said of her editorially:

"The death of Mrs. J. T. Sunderland yesterday, at her home on Oxford street, has removed from the activities of life one who in the fullest measure of the term represented the progressive woman of the twentieth century. A woman of the beautiful attributes, all heart and sympathy, with a mind of the finest fibre, a woman of worthy ambition, of culture and of attainments, she exerted an influence that was enviable. Possessed of learning obtained through earnest study and observation, she was no pedant. A woman who believed in the enfranchisement and the fullest development of her sex, she neglected nothing that pertained to her duty as a home-maker—as a wife and mother. The fruits of her life are many. Always busy in some good cause or working out something that should be for the enlightenment, the pleasure and entertainment of others, she leaves a record that must be a comfort to her stricken family, and that ought to be an incentive to every other woman who knows and understands the necessity of women performing their share in accelerating the great onward movement of the race. In life she was a gentle, uplifting influence; in death she is mourned, but her influence will live, justifying her life."

The *Hartford Courant* gave an extended sketch of Mrs. Sunderland's life and her public work in that city and elsewhere, from which we take the following facts.

She was born in Huntsville, Ill., in 1839, of parents who had migrated to the west when that part of the country was just being settled. Her father, a

Massachusetts man, bought a tract of land in Illinois and began the work of developing it and establishing a home, but soon died, leaving a wife and three young children. If this means that Mrs. Sunderland's childhood was spent under pioneer conditions and amid the hardships of the frontier, it also means that she received from those conditions and those hardships that splendid training in self-reliance,strength of character and resourcefulness which pioneer life has given to so many American men and women in the past, and which made her a natural leader throughout all her adult years.

When the west had done all for her in the way of schooling that it could do, she came East to that Mecca of the young women of the time, Mount Holyoke Seminary, to complete her education. On graduating she was invited at once to become a member of the faculty of the institution, but did not see her way to accept. Instead, she returned west, and became a teacher there. For five years she was principal of the high school in Aurora, Ill.,—being the first woman to hold a high school principalship in this country.

In 1871 she was married to Mr.Sunderland, and resided thereafter in Milwaukee, Wis., Northfield, Mass.,Chicago, Ill., Ann Arbor, Mich., Oakland, Cal., Toronto, Canada, and Hartford, where her husband held pastorates.

While living in Ann Arbor, and discharging with great devotion and faithfulness the duties of her home, taking a leading part in the activities of her husband's church and doing much outside public work, she found time to enter the University of Michigan, first as an undergraduate student and later as a post-graduate, and carry on five years of study, for which she received the degrees of Bachelor of Arts and Doctor of Philosophy.

At her death she left three children, Mrs. Safford, wife of Dr. Homer E. Safford of Detroit, Mich., Edson R. Sunderland, Professor of Law in the University of Michigan, and Florence Sunderland, a daughter who was teaching in the high school in New Britain, Conn., and living at home.

The range of Mrs. Sunderland's reading and study was extraordinary. As a high school teacher and principal her specialties were Latin, English literature and history. Her post-graduate work in the University of Michigan was mainly in philosophy and psychology, the subject of her thesis for her degree of doctor of philosophy being "The Relation of the Philosophy of Kant to that of Hegel." She gave long and careful attention to the philosophy, principles and improved methods of education, including moral and religious education, and wrote and spoke much on these subjects. She was a thorough student of Browning, and often gave addresses, papers and lectures on Browning's writings. She was a no less careful student of Ibsen. At the time she was stricken down by her last illness she was engaged in the preparation of four new Ibsen lectures.

She had traveled extensively, having been abroad twice, once for three months and once for thirteen months, the last time extending her travels to Greece, Egypt and Palestine.

She had written much for literary and religious papers and magazines. At one time she was associate editor of the "Illinois Social Science Journal," published in Chicago. She was the author of several Sunday School manuals which have had a wide use, and of a number of pamphlets on religious and educational subjects. In 1904 she published in book form an extended summary and re-statement of the theistic philosophy of James Martineau. For the past four years she had been engaged at intervals upon a book to be entitled "All the Best Bible Stories Re-told for Children," but the work is left only party finished. Among her best known writings are "Stories from Genesis" and "Heroes and Heroism" the latter having been reprinted in England.

She was prominent in her own religious denomination, no woman in the country being called upon oftener for addresses at local, state and national

Unitarian gatherings than she. She was one of the organizers and the first president of the Women's Western Unitarian Conference.

At the World's Parliament of Religions in Chicago, in 1893, she represented the Unitarian women of America, and gave one of the most notable addresses of the parliament. Though it was nearly an hour in length and delivered without a single note, the *Chicago Tribune* printed it in full, and said of it editorially: "Three thousand people in the Hall of Columbus stood up and cheered and applauded the remarkable address of Mrs. Eliza R. Sunderland. Her's was the clearest and most eloquent voice in all the great parliament of religions yesterday. She spoke on 'Comparative Religions', and she showed such depth of scholarship, and such clearness and force of expression, that the audience hailed her as easily the orator of the day." Rev. John C. Kimball said of the address, when the Parliament was over, that he found it had impressed the men from the Orient more than any other utterance of the great gathering; evidently too, all the more surprising them because coming from a woman.

In all the places in which Mrs. Sunderland lived she was not only a most earnest and efficient worker in the church with which she was connected, but a leader in literary circles and in many movements for the betterment of the community. In Ann Arbor, Mich., the seat of the state university, where she lived longest, she taught for fifteen yearsa Students' Bible Class which had an attendance of from 75 to more than 150. These young men and women were taken through extended systematic courses of study of the Old Testament and the New, Jewish History, the Life of Jesus, the Origins of Christianity, Great Epochs and Great Men in Christian History, Christian Sects and Movements of our Time, the History of Unitarianism, Religious Thought in the Nineteenth Century, and the Non-Christain Religions of the World.

She came to Hartford in October, 1906, and had been very active in religious, philanthropic, literary and educational work both in connection with Unity church and outside. She had been the leading spirit in organizing and carrying on the Women's Alliance and making it an effective agency not only in the work of Unity church but also in the philanthropic life of the city. On the first of October last she began teaching a large Sunday noon adult class at Unity church on the "Origin and Religious Significance of the Various Books of the Bible," carrying on the same until her illness began early in December. Last year she gave a series of seven sermons in her husband's pulpit, on alternate Sunday mornings from Christmas to Easter, covering "The Life and Most Important Teachings of Jesus." The sermons, which attracted much attention, were taken down in shorthand and were afterwards revised by her with a view to their publication as a book.

During her three and a half years' residence in Hartford she had given many addresses on literary, educational and religious subjects before women's societies in different churches of the city, the Motherhood Club, the College Club, the Equal Rights Association, the Women's Christian Temperance Union, and other organizations. She had also gone often to Springfield, New Haven, New York, Philadelphia and other places to speak on similar themes. She had spoken several times at the Capitol building before the Legislature or legislative committees, at public hearings on important questions concerning education, temperance, or the special interests of women and children, which were before the Legislature for its consideration and action. By the request of Mayor Henney she was one of the speakers at the last republican rally before the election of Mayor Hooker.

Two years ago Mrs. Sunderland was elected a member of the Board of School Visitors of Hartford. Upon this Board she served actively, attending its meetings with conscientious regularity, serving as chairman of one of its important committees and as an active worker on serveral others, and giving much

attention and time to making herself acquainted with the actual condition, the practical working and the needs of the various schools of the city. Her term would have expired in 1911.

Mrs. Sunderland was an illustration of a woman of both brain and heart; of high education, wide reading, literary taste and abiltity, and constant public activity, who never neglected her home or her family, but made all her reading and intellectual and public work contribute to the enriching of the life of her home. The wealth of her own life, which came from her reading, her intellectual and educational interests and her public activity, she gave to her husband and her children, thus showing that educated women may be and ought to be the most efficient of home makers and the best of wives and mothers.

——o——

The Unitarian Conference of the Middle States and Canada

To the ministers and churches of this Conference, and any persons of any conference who will be so helpful as to answer this letter:

The undersigned have been appointed by the Conference as a Committee on Parish Life, and instructed to secure such helpful suggestions for our parish and common life as may be possible. To this end will you kindly write very soon to the chairman of the committee? If it pleases you, you might send answers to the following questions. If you will make answer to better and wiser questions than are herein conveyed, that will be more helpful still.

In replying please write only on one side of your paper, so that the committee can cut up the letters and arrange them according to subjects.

Faithfully yours,
Charles E. St. John,
32 South 21st St., Philadelphia, Pa.
Alfred R. Hussey,
Elizabeth Padgham.

1. Can you suggest improvements in parish activity:—

a. As to the method or order of worship?

b. As to the objects in which a church may interest itself?

c. As to lay activity?

2. Can you suggest improvements in our relations between church and church:

a. As to uniformity of service?

b. As to co-operation in any form?

c. As to inter-church intercourse, exchange, or acquaintance?

3. Do you see any unnecessary weaknesses in our Unitarian methods, any ineffectiveness where we might be producing results?

4. Is it possible to put into the spirit and work of our Unitarian churches any power that is manifestly distinctive? Have we any appeal to persons whom all other churches fail to reach?

5. What can be done to arouse non-church-going Unitarians to a sense of personal responsibility for public worship?

6. How make it more clear that worship has moral value for the community?

7. While developing the idea that work is worship, can we still uphold the vital conviction that worship is work?

8. How can we improve the *esprit de corps*, within and among our churches? Is it entirely a question of the minister's personality?

9. Please describe the financial system of your church—for self-support, for public work, and for denominational contributions.

10. Please send the committee such a letter, not exceeding 1,000 words in length, as you would like to send to persons religiously indifferent to call them into active service; or at least give in outline the points you would make in such a letter. Out of these returns perhaps the committee can compile something which the American Unitarian Association would issue as a tract. Such a letter should be considerate, convincing, prophetic; a reasonable, yet urgent appeal to the sense of responsibility.

——o——

"No two people are Unitarians because they think *alike* in religion, but because, alike, they agree to *think* in religion."

The Modern Church

Conducted by REV. JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

COUNT Leo Tolstoi has somewhere written a little parable, which gives the most terrible and yet faithful picture of modern social conditions that I have ever seen. He compares the upper classes of society with a heavy man who sits firmly upon the shoulders of a feeble and stumbling laborer. The poor man underneath, overwhelmed by the weight of the burden which he is carrying, pants for breath and groans aloud in pain of body and anguish of spirit, until the man above is moved to compassion, and with his handerchief wipes the perspiration from his brow, and gives him a drink of water or a morsel of bread. He does everything in the world, as Tolstoi points out with bitter sarcasm, for the help and comfort of this man, upon whose shoulders he is upborne, excepting that one thing which is needful—*to get down*!*

Now, right here, in this fearful parable, do we have the most vivid presentation possible of that relation at present existing between the upper or wealthy classes upon the one hand and the lower or laboring classes upon the other, which consitutes the whole of our modern problem of social justice; and here also do we have the most relentless kind of portrayal of the almost criminal inadequacy of our conventional attempts to solve this problem. Here, in America to-day, as in every other modern industrial country, are millions of men and women, struggling to earn a decent living. Badly trained, ill-nourished, poorly housed, employed for long hours, paid pitifully small wages, crippled by industrial accidents, weakened by sickness, frequently idle by reason of seasonal occupations and recurring periods of industrial depression, the multitudes exist constantly upon the very edge of poverty. They know nothing of the blessings of home—they are denied the refreshment of leisure, play, and meditation—they eat bad food, wear insufficient clothes, and inhabit loathsome houses—they are the first to be frozen by the cold, the first to be prostrated by the heat, the first to be stricken by disease—their very children must be driven from the hearthstone to the factory to earn money to keep the wretched family together,—in short, they are poor, which means a minimum of joy and a maximum of woe. And we, looking upon them from out of our abundance, take pity upon their misery, and hold out our hands to give relief. We establish soup-kitchens and milk-depots and fresh-air funds; we build schools and churches and settlement-houses; we rear hospitals and mission-chapels, houses of refuge and reformatories; we organize charity societies and philanthropic agencies of every possible description. We give food to the hungry, drink to the thirsty, clothing to the naked. We give welcome to the stranger, we visit the sick, and we go unto those who are in prison. In short, moved to pity by the miseries of our less fortunate fellow-beings, we do all that is summed up in that familiar word, Charity; and then, in perfect peace of mind and contentment of heart, are blind to the cruel inadequacy of the service rendered.

Within recent years, however, our consciences, hitherto so calm and undisturbed, have been most rudely jolted. Zealous and inconsiderate men are springing up on every side and telling us that all that we are doing in the way of charity, for the relief of the ignorant, unfortunate and depraved, while very generous and testifying eloquently to our kindness of heart, is almost wholly misdirected and is woefully inadequate to meet the exigencies of the existing situation. We are being informed, in the harshest kind of way, that the miseries of the poor and down-trodden

of mankind are due not at all to their "defective personalities," but "result directly from social conditions."—"The poor who suffer in their poverty," says Dr. Edward T. Devine, in his remarkable book, "Misery and Its Causes", which I have quoted before and shall probably quote many times again, "are not poor because they are shiftless, because they are undisciplined, because they drink because they steal, because they have superfluous children, because of personal depravity, personal inclination and natural preference; (but) they are shiftless and undisciplined and drink and steal and are unable to care for their numerous children because our social institutions and economic arrangements are at fault.– – – Evil passions and indolence produce misery, but it does not follow that misery, all misery or most misery, is to be attributed to indolence or evil passions." – – –It is to be attributed "in the main to social maladjustment—to adverse conditions over which the individual who suffers is unable to exercise effective control but which are not beyond social control." The millions who suffer, that is, are the helpless victims of an iniquitously unjust industrial and political system. They are poor because it is the doom of the social order of which they are a part that they shall be poor. They are wretched because they are industrial slaves—because they are fettered servants of the upper classes—because they sow that others may reap, toil that others may gather in, create wealth that others may spend it. They are miserable because it is the decree of industrial fate that the favored few shall "toil not, neither spin—yet Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these"; while the helpless many shall "toil and spin" from early morning till late at night,—yet Lazarus with all his sores was not as pitiful as one of these. The fact of the matter is that the lower classes are poor and diseased and crippled—perishing in wretchedness and want,—simply and solely because they are carrying the upper classes upon their backs. Tolstoi's parable is true! And in such case, charity no longer suffices. It is not enough for the man on top to wipe the brow of his panting brother underneath, or to give bread to his fainting lips, or water to his parched throat. The only thing that will suffice is that the man on top get off his brothers shoulders and walk on his own feet—and this means *justice*! It means that we shall come to see the inadequacy of our soup-kitchens and mission-chapels and settlement-houses,—that we shall come to despise our charitable societies and philanthropic agencies,—that we shall be ashamed to rest content with giving food to the hungry, drink to the thirsty, and clothing to the naked. It means that we shall resolve to do the one thing needful—get down off our brother's back, change the "adverse conditions over which the individual who suffers is unable to exercise effective control, but which are not beyond social control", destroy all that "social maladjustment" which lies at the bottom of our difficulties. It means that we shall provide employment for every willing worker,—give the laborer his due share of the wealth which he creates,—protect him from industrial accidents and shelter him from the physical weakness and disability which come from dirty streets, congested slums, disease-laden tenements, exhausting hours and intolerable conditions of toil,—banish his inefficiency by industrial training, dispel his ignorance by education, shelter his old age by pensions, guard his women from industrial oppression and his children from untimely labor, destroy the liquor traffic, emancipate him from industrial exploitation, relieve him of the crushing load of a protective tariff, distribute equitably the burden of taxation by income-taxes and inheritance taxes and land-taxes, confer upon him the ownership of all natural resources and public utilities and all industrial enterprises which are public and not private in their nature,—crown him, in a word, with the fruit of industrial as well as political democracy. It means, in short, that society shall be made over, so that justice shall supplant injustice, equality privilege, and freedom slavery. It means that a new system shall be

established which shall be conducive not to the greatest good of the greatest number, but to as much good as possible for all. It means that the one man shall no longer ride upon his brother's back and give him charity, but that both shall walk side by side, each sharing justly with the other.

And what, you say has all this got to do with the question of the church? Just this!—that, for reasons which were perhaps inevitable but which are none the less tragic, the churches are to-day very largely in the hands of "the man on top," and thus the agency which ought to come most quickly to the relief of the man underneath is prevented from doing anything in his behalf. The "man on top" does not propose that the church which he supports shall have a hand in throwing him off his brother's shoulders. He is willing that it shall give him food and drink, and wipe his fevered brow,—but nothing more. Hence, it follows that the church is still in the period of charity and has not yet seen the vision of justice. President Faunce, of Brown University, has stated the whole truth in a recent address wherein he said,—"The deacons of the church have shown fine eagerness in assisting, out of the monthly collection for the poor, some woman sapped of strength by night work in a factory. But any attempt to enact such laws as shall render night work for women impossible —that is hardly yet recognized as distinctly Christian effort. Church members have shown genuine brotherly kindness to the poor brakeman crushed between the cars, but any movement to secure safer appliances for coupling cars has been looked upon as purely economic, or possibly political, and outside the realms of recognized church activity. We have gathered children by thousands into Sunday-school for instruction in Christian truth, and this is surely important. But have we inquired how many hours those children are working in stores and mills, and have we made any organized attempt to secure for them a real and unstunted childhood. To rescue the fallen is clearly Christian; but to prevent men from falling—are we clear that this is a task still more deeply Christian?"

Such work as this can alone be regarded to-day as worthy of the church of God, and we might as well recognize it to-day as to-morrow.

———o———

The Children and the Church

At a recent meeting of the New England Associate Alliance, a great deal of attention was given to the matter of the attendance of children at regular church services. The general opinion was that children should be taken to church as early as possible, the assumption being that if they form the habit of going to church in their early years, as they grow older they will consider this the only thing to do. Various methods of "breaking them in" were suggested, and one lady said emphatically that children should be made to go to church whether they like it or not, ignoring the fact that the reason given by many who do not go to church is that they were obliged to go when they were children, and propose now to spend Sunday as they please.

This attitude seems strangely out of keeping with Unitarian traditions and doctrines. The evangelical churches of a generation ago claimed to hold the key of eternal salvation, and demanded church attendance as a sign of faith. The children were souls in danger of hell-fire whose natural instincts must be suppressed, whose minds must be filled with mysterious doctrines, and whose hearts must be stirred to a sense of wickedness. Our church to-day has no such hold upon people. It offers no rewards and makes no threats. Its only dogma is liberty and its only confession of faith is human brotherhood. It claims no authority over the opinions or actions of its members. So church attendance becomes a matter of voluntary loyalty.

The success of the church depends upon its serving the needs of its people. It must satisfy their craving for truth. It must restore and strengthen the weary. It must inspire them with courage and all moral virtues. It must provide an organization for united action

in the service of the community, and a field of social intercourse. And it must win the children to its support and train them for its service by meeting the needs of their growing souls rather than by forcing them to attend services not primarily intended for them.

It is true that the children of to-day must build the church of to-morrow, and it is one of our chief responsibilities to prepare them for this duty. In many churches the Sunday School serves this purpose, but it has serious limitations. It does not lead the child directly into church life, its organization and service being entirely different from those of the church. Hence the necessity, so keenly felt, of getting the children into church services as well.

Where a fine organization and efficient teachers are available, the Sunday School is a noble institution, and well worthy of the devotion given to it by thousands of loyal workers. But these elements lacking, as they are in some communities, the effort to maintain a Sunday School is often a severe drain upon the church, and fails to serve the purpose for which it is intended.

Under these conditions, or wherever it might seem desirable, I would advocate the substitution of a Children's Church Service for the Sunday School. It should satisfy the child's natural longing to share in a dignified service of worship and praise, and should include a short sermon or talk leading into spiritual matters from the child's point of view. It should be planned throughout for the children, and they should feel that it is their service, in exactly the same sense that they are expected to regard the regular service when they are old enough to enjoy it.

The presence of little children at a church service is usually a trial to themselves and to others, especially during the sermon, which, if it is prepared beforehand, makes no provision for the little ones. Let the preacher use an illustration which is of interest to them, and not only do they respond, but all the grown-ups find their heart touched and their souls quickened by this note of sympathy which unites them with their children. We never worship more spontaneously than when we behold the soul-light in the eyes of children. So I should advocate that parents should attend a Children's Service, rather than, as at present, that children should be compelled to attend the regular service with their parents.

Local conditions would of course determine the method of conducting such a service. A vesper service would no doubt attract children and their parents from outside the church, but where the service was intended for the children of the parish, it would be more convenient to have it just before or after the regular morning service. The kindergarten class during the regular service, which is so popular in many churches, should be continued or established, but all children between the kindergarten age, and that at which they find the regular service interesting, should be urged to attend the Children's Service, and their parents encouraged to attend with them.

As far as possible, the group system of organization should be retained. Children of the same age should sit together under the care of a guardian, whose duty it would be to keep a record of attendance, encourage order, attention, and earnestness, on the part of the children. Each group should meet at another time during the week for some kind of church work. The guardians should constitute a committee for the management of the Children's Service aiming to make it as beautiful and intelligible as possible. If the regular minister does not conduct the service, the guardians might take turns in doing so, or invite various church members to do so. As far as practicable the older children should be allowed to assist in leading the services, and much stress should be laid upon singing and intelligent responses. Some graceful physical exercises might be introduced as part of the service to instil the idea of harmony between body and soul, as well as to relieve any restlessness among the smaller children.

I should be very glad to receive opinions and criticisms in regard to this suggestion, especially in the nature of reports on experiments of this nature.

I should like to know if others have felt this need as keenly as I, and to gain practical information as to the class of churches where such a plan might be used, and the manner in which it could be applied.

Anita Trueman Pickett.
Sandwich, Mass., First Parish Church.

OUR READER'S EXCHANGE

"Higher" or "Lower" Criticism of Jesus.

To the Editor of the Unitarian:

A correspondent in the March number of the Unitarian, referring to many denunciations which, according to the gospel record, Jesus pours upon the scribes and Pharisees, uses these words: "I, personally, gravely doubt whether Jesus ever uttered these words, and, if he did, then I say he was away below the level he attained when he said 'Neither do I condemn thee, go thou and sin no more,' and when on the cross he said 'Father forgive them they know not what they do.' It would be a brave man who would attempt to gauge the more or less in these several offenders. The presumption must be that Jesus never forsook the attitude of petition and pity."

I call attention to the character of this criticism because it is typical of a good deal of the free and easy handling of the gospel record, which chooses as genuine sayings of Jesus only those words which fit in with a personal belief or preference, and rejects all others. In so far as it rests only upon personal grounds it may be regarded as a special form of the Lower Criticism as opposed to the Higher Criticism. The latter seeks to determine what are the genuine sayings of Jesus with reference to broad considerations of historical, literary and spiritual facts or probabilities.

In the criticism which I have quoted the conclusion which is contained in the last sentence, "that Jesus never forsook the attitude of petition and pity" may be the wish of the writer, but it is certainly not justified by his mere personal doubt or preference, nor is it forced upon the impartial student of the life of Jesus as a necessary implication of his character. We are told that "it would be a brave man who would attempt to gauge the more or less in these several offenders". But that is precisely what we are considering in the person of Jesus, a very brave man, clear-eyed to observe distinctions of character, and able, by a few swift strokes, to paint an immortal word picture of the differing types which should fix their respective moral values forever in human thought. The difference has been made so plain by Jesus that a child may see how natural it is to forgive a repentant sinner who desires to turn from the evil he confesses and hates and the proud, complacent, intolerant formalist, who has no pity and does not know his own need of forgiveness. Jesus again and again tells us that not even God can forgive the unforgiving. In the name of those who were injured by the merciless and exclusive spirit of these who should have been the guides and friends of the humble and helpless, Jesus denounces a natural doom. Neither Jesus nor God could pardon these men who sat in the seats of religious authority, who were themselves the chief stumbling blocks in the way of the people, who had forsaken their role of shepherds, but still wore the garb, and claimed the honors, becoming as ravening wolves in this disguise. They were hireling shepherds who added to the burdens, and dangers and hopelessness of the people, who still looked to them as their appointed religious leaders.

So far as the relation of this attitude to the character of Jesus is concerned, let me quote a passage from the late Dean Everett. "As regards the indignant utterances against the scribes and Pharisees, so far from being a cloud upon the character of Jesus we may feel that they are characteristic of one of the most glorious aspects of it. For a moral character that is incapable of ethical wrath is imperfect. Jesus meets injustice toward himself with absolute gentleness and meekness and forgiveness, but harshness and injustice toward the humble of this world call out in him a

holy indignation which we cannot too much admire."

If the gospel record shows Jesus to be against us in any particular conviction which we may hold, is it not fairer for us to say frankly that we differ with Jesus on this point, rather than to try to discredit the testimony where it is so strong and difficult to shake as in the dealings of Jesus with the Pharisees? The good old orthodox Scotchwoman might teach us this frankness. She was objecting to walking upon the Sabbath, when some one pointed to the example of Jesus, who, himself walked upon the Sabbath. She said "Well, I dinna think ony the better o' him for that."

Frederic J. Gauld.

Leominister, Mass. March 16, 1910.

Symposium

"Why does not the Unitarian Gospel more generally reach the industrial classes of people, especially in our larger cities?"

Rev. Hobart Clark, Minister of the Church of the Redeemer, Staten Island, N. Y.

I think that your question ought to read, "Why does not the Unitarian gospel more generally reach the industrial classes of people *here in the United States*?" because it certainly does reach the industral classes in most of our English churches, or "chapels," and commands their interest and sympathy, although we claim to be the more democratic people. Just why it fails to do so here is a question not easily answered because no single reason can be given. It is no doubt largely because our usually simple service fails to appeal to the imagination and emotion of those of that class who are or can be really interested in religion, and because we have formed the habit of appealing to intellect rather than to sentiment, and emotion; often emphasizing dogmatic issues which are to the average man, and woman of today uninteresting and, as we all know, rapidly becoming obsolete. But it appears to me that the principal reason why our gospel fails to reach the industrial classes here in America is that it is more or less hindered by social barriers. The good people in our churches seem to prefer to come into touch with the industrial classes elsewhere; and to help them by the aid of other instiutions and agencies, either charitable, or educational, but *outside the church*. They fail to identify their church, and its gospel with that "Social Service" in which they are personally so deeply and actively interested. They often fail to see that the social service of the Holy Spirit of religion, freely and openly given to the heart and mind of those who are not otherwise hungry or sick or poor and helpless, is as greatly needed as any other kind of social service; often more so by many intelligent self respecting people of the industrial classes who are perfectly well able to take care of themselves, and to appreciate our gospel, but whom it does not reach because they are for some reason, not made to feel at home in our churches. The fault is perhaps as much theirs as it is ours, but it is unfortunate. In England certain social lines and distinctions are taken as a matter of course by all parties; and so they do not become a hindrance to any gospel. In other churches here when such lines exist they are successfully overcome, or ignored, and so the gospel proclaimed in these churches reaches a much larger number of people of the industrial classes than our Unitarian gospel is able to reach, although I am told that it does reach many in those classes who do not know that it is ours, and who attend no church at all.

Hobart Clark.

Rev. William M. Brundage, Ph. D. Minister of Unity Church, Brooklyn.

All churches, except possibly the Roman Catholic, find it a difficult problem to reach any class of people in our large cities; the conditions are so much more complicated than in a small town. Men's lives are so full of other things that their higher interests are neglected. Great numbers of the industrial classes share this widespread indifference to religion.

In addition, however, to this general cause which affects all alike, I am more and more convinced that there is among wage-earners a growing suspicion that the churches are the apologists of unjust economic and social conditions, Unitarian as well as other churches. Our Unitarian gospel would naturally attract intelligent workers, if we could only convince them that we are actually in earnest when we claim to "accept the religion of Jesus," the actual religion which he lived, of trust in the good God, and of devoted service to man. If they could once be convinced that our professions are sincere, that in the spirit of the Master we are trying to establish here on earth the Kingdom of God, the Brotherhood of man, that we too are profoundly interested in the very social problems they are seeking to solve, they would come to us in greater numbers.

What are we doing to convince them of this? Are we giving up the rented pew system and making our churches actually free, actually democratic? Do wage earners always meet with a cordial welcome at the church door? Do we go out where they are, and urge them to come and hear our gospel? Do we hold in our churches open conferences for the serious consideration of all proposed reforms? Do we encourage the workers to speak out frankly what their hearts are burning to express?

I fear that the most of us only half believe in our own gospel. I fear that too many of us are only acting a part. We speak eloquently at our conferences and among ourselves of our glorious gospel, and yet are afraid to apply it to the conditions that exist in this year of our Lord 1910. We are afraid of being called extreme radicals, socialists, disturbers of society, if we take Jesus' own words, such as "How hardly shall they that have riches enter into the kingdom of God," as our texts, and show what they mean for us to-day.

When we Unitarians, laymen and and ministers alike, become perfectly sincere, cease deceiving ourselves, perhaps our most serious failing, and begin to live as we pray, we shall be able to reach more generally the industrial classes. Our theory is well nigh perfect.

William M. Brundage.

Rev. Chas. E. St. John, Minister of the First Unitarian Church, Philadelphia.

The trouble is not with our gospel but mainly with the people themselves. The gospel has reached them, but they are at present occupied with other things. In the scale of daily life the people to whom our question applies rank religion below bread, clothings, comfort in labor, health and amusement. Rightly or wrongly they believe that conditions force them to do so. And so long as they continue to make religion the least of their interests, so long will they listen most readily to such churches as profess to have something to give them in line with their desires and needs. They may listen to the priest who holds the key to heaven, or to the healer who proffers them physical health. But in their present mood they will not give heed to the kingdom of heaven until it offers more than a promise that "all these things", shorter hours of work, better houses, and more abundant loaves, will be added unto them. They demand a contract.

I know a Unitarian church situated close to a large industrial section of a great city, which is most democratic in its spirit, and which has had in succession three public-spirited, brotherly, able, practical ministers. The laboring people know that this church is open to them and that its ministers have longed for them but they neglect it. The failure to connect is on the people's part. They are impatient of a gospel that makes character the first aim of life.

Should we change our tactics, give up our confidence in the inspiring power of truth, and in the worth of the human soul? Should we, as certain corrupt political managers, rally as many votes as they can pay for, offer men salvation through a Savior's effort? Should we proclaim "all ye who will join us shall have a reconstructed social order, and in that regeneration ye shall sit on thrones judging the tribes of the world?"

No, we shall serve men best by the steadfast and loving appeal to their hearts. This or some kindred influence will eventually induce all men to discover that spiritual values are real, that thought is a moral help, that worship is happiness, and moreover that this sort of happiness ranks higher in human life than that of financial success. We must continue in brotherly endeavor to share the troubles of mankind, and must make our own lives glow with the beauty of our faith until at last one toiler after another brushes the cobwebs from his mental eyes and notices what a power for the ennobling of life lies in our gospel. When at last the industrial classes get a truer balance in their estimates of life some of them, many of them, will accept what has so steadily blessed us.

Charles E. St. John.

Augustus P. Reccord, Minister of the Church of the Unity, Springfield, Mass.

I confess that I do not know, and, strange as it may appear, I do not much care. I cannot but deprecate the constant effort to array the classes against the masses and to state why we reach one and not the other. Why not demonstrate the fact before seeking to account for it? A candid attempt to analyze existing conditions might remove the necessity of an explanation. I believe that if the truth were known, it would be found that the industrial classes are present, or at least represented, in larger numbers than we think. Some of our churches are composed almost exclusively of the "capitalistic" class; others of the industrial class; but the great majority of them are made up of all sorts and conditions of men. Some of our Unitarian people sit in their pews on Sunday in smug complacency, thinking that the congregation is drawn from "their set", and ignorant of the fact that all around them are members of the industrial group. Working men do not attend church in overalls and jumpers. With clean hands and faces and dressed in their Sunday clothes they are not to be distinguished from many of the capitalistic class.

I write this for the encouragement of those of my brother ministers who are accustomed to have hurled at them, by friend and foe alike, the statement that the common people heard Jesus gladly. The implication is supposed to be obvious. But when did the common people hear Jesus gladly? They heard him when he seemed to champion their cause against injustice and oppression. They listened, with glee, whenever he crossed swords with the Scribes and Pharisees, their hereditary foes. They followed him as long as they conceived of him as a mere wonder-worker, "a Barabbas and a Schlatter rolled into one. When he told them that they had mistaken his mission, that he had come as preacher of the gospel of the Kingdom, they left him and went their way.

This is the lesson of history. Popularity has never been a test of truth. The greatest obstacle to the extension of the liberal faith has been its simplicity and reasonableness. Give men a priest or a mediator, through whom they can have access to the Father, and they accept him without question. Tell them that they need no mediator, that the door is always wide open, and they refuse to believe you. Give them a scheme of salvation, no matter how complicated, and they cling to it with a tenacity which is worthy of a better purpose. Tell them that every man is his own Saviour and they look upon it as a fable. We cannot escape the fact that the Church which has the strongest hold upon the masses today is the Church whose doctrines and polity are farthest removed from the simple teachings and methods of Jesus. The more common the people are, the more ignorant and un-

tutored and superstitious, the stronger that hold seems to be.

Why not admit that the liberal faith stands for ideas and ideals to which the common people have never listened gladly? Their temper and mood are not essentially different today. If they are disappointingly tardy in accepting our message, this does not prove that the message is not true. Neither does it signify that they are without sufficient intelligence and culture to understand and appreciate it. It means that they do not want it. It means that they have not the moral courage to take it and apply it to the problems of their daily living. They still find it easier to believe than to think, easier to accept on faith than to deduce from logical evidence to trust in a salvation that cometh down from above, purchased by the blood of an innocent man, than in a salvation that they must work out for themselves in fear and trembling, inspired by a genuine love for God and a sincere affection for their fellow men. Under such conditions we may expect to find that the liberal faith, will be in the future, as it has been in the past, to some a stumbling block, and to others foolishness, but to them that dare to accept it, both the power of God and the wisdom of God.

Augustus P. Reccord.

Springfield, Mass.

Rev. R. J. Hutcheon, First Unitarian Church, Toronto.

Is it strictly true that Unitarianism fails to appeal to the industrial class? I think not. In the great centres of England, I understand that the members and adherents of the Unitarian church are largely drawn from that class. In my own church in Toronto and other churches known to me, it is well represented.

So far as the charge is true, the causes are probably of two kinds: general and local.

In the nature of things, Unitarianism cannot appeal to a large number in any class. The majority of people always take their religion, like their politics, traditionally. They do not think and feel their way independently into either. The force of tradition behind them and of collective influence around them determines their creeds and in very few communities does this force help them into Unitarianism. It is vain to hope to appeal to any but people of independent thought and they always form a small percentage of the total. But as there is just as large a proportion of independent thinkers in the industrial class as in any other class, there is no reason *in the nature of things* why that class should not be well represented in every Unitarian church.

If it is not well represented, the cause is probably local. Many of our Unitarian churches came into existence before the industrial period in America began. They originated among the professional and commercial classes. They met the need of the time for intellectual and moral freedom. Their appeal was to the individual in his struggle for independence of thought and character. But the problems of to-day are different. The struggle is social rather than individual. Class-consciousness is strong, the artisan doesn't care to use institutions which he didn't help to found. Hence many of the older churches are handicapped by their origin and early purpose. Probably they are too class-conscious themselves, and too conservative for the time but however anxious they may be to draw the industrial class in, the spirit of independence in that class tends to keep them out.

But where our churches are of more recent origin and all classes are represented in their foundation and social justice as well as intellectual liberty is aimed at, I see no reason why the thoughtful artisan should not be well represented in them.

R. J. Hutcheon.

If the crosses of life must sometimes make us sad, never, O Lord, may they make us ashamed; but may thy wisdom subdue us and thy peace be with us, and, when we are weakest, make us strongest—*James Martineau.*

New England Letter

By REV. ALSON H. ROBINSON

YOUR correspondent is not entirely without experience in the field of journalistic enterprise, and he sometimes wonders if the possibilities of a very good "penny-a-liner" were not thrown away in order to create an average Unitarian parson. Perhaps his success along lines of daily publicity was due to the large liberty which he enjoyed. He was associated with one of those moderately yellow journals by which the eleventh commandment that "Thou shalt not have the perversion of the truth for a gainful occupation" had never been dreamed of, and whose motto was that nothing could be wrong so long as it was printed. The result was that he was able to produce copy which was often time eminently worth while in the estimation of the city editor and the exaggeration of adjectives a frequent source of commendation.

If in the composition of this monthly letter to the UNITARIAN he were allowed the same liberty, and were permitted to report personal situations which are constantly called to his attention; or even the inside history of some of our churches as they exist today, he would be able to dictate either success or failure for this magazine. Either commendation and ostracism on the one hand or such popularity and power on the other, that the entire policy of our denomination might be dictated from the pages of this publication, would be the inevitable result.

But since this liberty is denied your correspondent, and wisely so, he will attempt to record with moderate language some of the things that he sees and hears, which are common possessions in this "Land of the large and charitable air."

The commanding generals of 25 Beacon Street, as this letter goes to the editor, have forsaken headquarters and have taken to the field—Dr. Eliot in the South and Secretary Wilson in the West. When they return they will both doubtless have interesting experiences to relate, and we may look forward with keen expectation to the "Notes of an Itinerant." Meanwhile the genial personality and warm hospitality of Mr. Fox, and his long experience with the affairs of the Association, compel the feeling that the army at home is ably officered. The foreign secretary, Mr. Wendte, seems hard pressed to arrange for all the Unitarians who are making the Berlin meetings an excuse to get to Europe next Summer, and Channing Brown is still registered as a nurse for sick churches, to answer an emergency call at a moment's notice.

The churches of New England during the past month seem more than ever to have pursued the even tenor of their ways. Rev. D. R. Freeman has recently been installed in Braintree, and will build upon the foundation so splendidly laid by Griffin, of Montreal. Rev. Louis C. Dethlefs has left Walpole, Mass., and has gone to Hyde Park. This society in Hyde Park merits high commendation for the loyalty and energy which its members have shown during the past few months. Extensive repairs have been made on the church building, which is now a plant of unusual merit, and a branch of the Y. P. R. U. has been organized in spite of the absence of a settled minister.

Reports of the annual meetings of the various societies all over New England, so far as it is possible to procure returns from these events, show a steady gain over a year ago, in spite of the assertion of Dr. Crothers that instead of living in the land of the Pilgrim fathers and of Puritan traditions, we are pioneers of the Protestant frontier. Woburn, for example, reports an attendance at its meeting of two hundred; Manchester, N. H. a balance in its treasury of three hundred dollars; Marlborough, Mass., has celebrated the twentieth anniversary

of the settlement of Mr. Hayward; Concord, N. H., under the leadership of Mr. Snow, falls into line with its extended interests and promises much in the matter of future accomplishment. Mr. Forbes at Meeting House Hill has quite recovered from his recent illness and with the assistance of Miss Fagan, a graduate of The Tuckerman School, is developing the possibilities of this old Parish to a remarkable degree.

Perhaps one of the most significant events in the history of our churches is the resignation of Rev. Austin Garver, after a ministry of twenty-five years at the second Parish in Worcester. To rightly estimate the influence of this church and of Mr. Garver's ministry one must take into account the varied activities of city, state and nation in which the distinguished men who have been members of this church have been engaged. The following extract from a set of resolutions adopted by the Parish in accepting Mr. Garver's resignation expresses as well as may be, perhaps, the spirit of the present situation.

"The second Parish of Worcester, reluctantly, and with deep regret, accepts the resignation offered by its minister, Rev. Austin S. Garver, to take effect June 1, 1910. The breaking of this tie is of serious import to the parish and its members. For a quarter of a century we have been most faithfully and acceptably served and guided by one who, in his life, his character, his scholarship and attainments and his devotion, has proved himself in all ways worthy, and who has completely won our confidence, our respect, and our love." By unanimous vote, Mr. Garver was asked to remain with the parish as minister *emeritus*. The church has had but four ministers in its long and honorable history, and on March 11 it celebrated the one hundred and twenty-fifth anniversary of its founding and the twenty-fifth anniversary of Mr. Garver's installation.

At least four of our more influential churches are without ministers, namely: Waltham, Newton (Channing Church), Dorchester (Third Religious Society) and Somerville, and some important moves may be expected this Spring.

The ministers of many of our country churches seem to have entered upon a larger appreciation of the importance and possibilities of their tasks than ever before. The tide of migration from the cities back to the country towns, which is surely taking place in New England, is bound to have a profound effect on these rural societies. I know a number of Boston business men who are buying farms within a radius of fifty miles from town, with the intention of living on these places and joining the constantly growing army of commuters.

This leaves more perplexing problems than ever for the city churches, as well as creating new ones for the country. And one may almost see a justification for the cry that was raised not long ago by Dr. Worcester as Rector of what we had all thought an impregnable organization to "endow Emanuel." We evidently cannot be so confident as formerly that the Back Bay is free from the invasion of foreign immigration. But what of the country church? The application of scientific principles of agriculture is sure, in time, to draw thoughtful men to the country communities, who in turn are sure to demand the maintenance and spread of a gospel, greatly at variance with the theology of the typical country church, and more in harmony with the best scientific and social thought of our day.

Under the able leadership of Dr. Beane the society at Grafton is entering upon an era of greater activity than it has enjoyed for many years. The Sunday School is large and prosperous, and the attendance at the Sunday services is constantly increasing.

Progress along the lines of church building and construction is at least up to the average mark. Work on the splendid church at Lynn is moving forward with steady pace. This building, which is to be one of the finest of our community in Eastern Massachusetts, has been made possible by the beneficence of the late Charles Newhall, of Lynn. The architects are those of the West Newton church, with which it

has some features in common. The memorial windows are already provided for, and it is hoped to dedicate the church and parish house in the early Autumn. The society at Chestnut Hill, Brookline, has resolved to abandon the modest frame chapel in which it has worshipped for some years under the ministry of Mr. Hale, and plans for the erection of a stone chapel are under consideration, and work is to begin very soon. A valuable acquisition to the equipment of Unitarianism in Waverly is the construction of a parish house, which is nearly completed.

During the past Winter, the department of Social Service has conducted a series of meetings in the First Parish Church, Cambridge, which have scarcely enjoyed the publicity which they merit. These meetings have been successful both in the interest which many persons have manifested in the addresses and discussions, and in the actual attempt at the relief of modern social conditions.

During the months of March and April the experiment of holding these meetings in the Austin Street Church in Cambridge is being made, since this church is the center of residence of people of greater diversity of tastes and conditions than is true of the First Parish. The comprehensive character of these meetings may be judged by mere reference to the clientele of the committee in charge. Mr. Adams and Mr. Johnson are professors in Harvard. Messrs. Akerstrom, Joel and Morrison are representatives of the Central Labor Union and of the American Federation of Labor. Other members are Mr. Forbes, Dr. Crothers and Mr. Saunderson.

The programme of these meetings for March and April is such an interesting and significant one that I give some of the details. On March 6th, Mr. John Nolan, of Cambridge, a landscape architect and city planner of national reputation, gave an illustrated lecture on "The Civic Awakening"; on the 13th of March, instead of an address, Mrs. Helen Weil, of Cambridge, read the epoch making play of Charles Rann Kennedy, "The Servant in the House"; on Sunday evening, the 20th of March, Prof. C. A. Adams, of the electrical department of Harvard, delivered a stimulating address on "The Way Out", being an exposition and defence of the single tax theory of Henry George; on the evening of March 27th, Mr. Louis Brandeis, of Boston, spoke on "Saving Bank Life Insurance and Old Age Annuities." This address outlined the necessity of every man providing for his family in the event of his own death, and provision as well against old age. A comparison was made between the various systems of working men's insurance in England, Germany and this country and the superiority of the Massachusetts plan, by which the independent worker provides his own insurance and old age annuity by buying a policy from one of the sayings banks, was explained. Mr. Brandeis spoke with peculiar authority of this matter, since he may be described as the father of this form of working men's insurance. The meetings announced for next month are as follows: April 3rd, Mr. John F. Tobin, President of the Boot and Shoe Workers' Union, a man of large experience in labor matters, will speak on "Trade Unionism and Labor Problems"; April 10th, Mr. Edward J. Ward, of Rochester, N. Y., a successful worker in the organization of neighborhoods for the development of the best functions of community life, will speak on "Social Centres." The success of these meetings is being watched with considerable interest by the leaders of churches in other Boston suburbs, and it is likely that experiments along similar lines may be inaugurated in the autumn.

All Souls' Church

On Wednesday evening occurred the installation of Rev. Daniel Roy Freeman as minister of All Souls' church. An audience that taxed the seating capacity of the auditorium began to gather shortly after seven o'clock. By half-past seven the place was well filled. The order of service opened with the playing of a "Romanze" of Svendsen's by the organist of the church, Mrs. Jennie

Hocking Hunt. At its conclusion scripture was read and prayer offered by Rev. Charles E. Park of the First church of Boston.

After the singing of a hymn by the congregation Rev. Charles Conklin, superintendent of churches for New England, in the Universalist denomination, gave one of two addresses of the evening on "The vocation of a Liberal church." Liberalism, he said, wherever it exists, differs from orthodoxy not so much in its theology as in its habit of mind. Orthodoxy holds to a system of religious beliefs which it regards as closed and final. Liberalism has its eyes turned constantly upwards with the expectation of seeing fresh light. Orthodoxy fears new truth. Liberalism welcomes nothing so eagerly as new truth. The one regards the book of God's speech as closed. The other thinks it has only begun to be written. Everywhere, in advancing history, in developing human nature, in growing scientific knowledge, in the vast and intricate wonders of nature increasingly known liberalism thinks that it adds new words to the vocabulary with which it hears God speak. Openness to truth from whatever quarter it may come, said Mr. Conklin, characterizes liberalism. With a plea for the faith that makes faithful he closed his address. The audience then listened to Turner's "Great and Marvelous," sung by the choir of All Souls'.

Rev. Paul Revere Frothingham, minister of Arlington street church, Unitarian, Boston, delivered the second address of the evening upon the same subject as that of Dr. Conklin. Man, he said, is incurably religious. In their serious moments all thinking men must realize with awe if not with reverence their uttermost dependence upon the One Who Is To supply the need for worship, worship that shall not violate reason, that shall fire the emotions, that shall invigorate the whole man, head, heart, and hand. This is the function of a Liberal Church. Following his address was a soprano solo by Mrs. James H. Slade.

Dr. William Gallagher, of Thayer academy then extended to Mr. Freeman the right hand of welcome to the community. In very happy vein Dr. Gallagher called the new minister to "a man's work." The problem that confronted him, he said, had to do not with a theological trinity, but with a practical trinity with a town geographically divided into three parts, and cut into by diverse interests. He enjoined Mr. Freeman to concern himself with those things which pertain to common welfare, and promote the general good.

Rev. Frederick R. Griffin, former minister of All Souls', present pastor of the Unitarian church in Montreal, gave the concluding address, which consisted of a "charge to the people." His words were a rare combination of sanity, strength and tenderness. His conception of a church as a group of persons, not one alone a minister, but all ministers, each holding himself responsible for maintaining unsullied the high ideal of life for which the institution stands, the preacher but a leader among equals, he proclaimed with sincerity and power. In earnest persuasiveness he besought the people to give themselves with increasing devotion to the bringing to pass in themselves and among mankind of genuinely honorable manhood and womanhood.

After the singing of a hymn by the congregation and the pronouncement of the benediction by Mr. Freeman, the exercises were concluded by the playing of Mendelssohn's "Finale to the Third Symphony" by Mrs. Jennie Hocking Hunt. The evening, throughout was one of unusual friendliness of feeling and candor of utterance.

There will be a public reception to Rev. and Mrs. D. Roy Freeman on Wednesday evening, March 23, in the church parlors from eight to ten o'clock.

—*Braintree Observer.*

———o———

He who floats with the current, who does not guide himself according to higher principles, who has no ideals, no convictions,—such a man is a mere article of the world's furniture, a thing moved, instead of living, moving being; an echo, not a voice.—*Amiel.*

Notes from the Field

Fourth Unitarian Brooklyn, N. Y.
Rev. Leon A. Harvey Minister

The annual meeting was held Tuesday evening, March 15. Dinner was served at 7, and the meeting followed at 8. The reports from the Church Committee, the Sunday-school, the Women's Alliance, the Unitarian Club, the Dramatic Club, and the Good Citizenship Class were submitted, and all showed a successful year's work. The report of the treasurer, Mrs. George Nichols, was especially gratifying. The society raised during the year $4,200, and all bills are paid. This amount is $900 more than the previous year. The minister reported eighty-seven names of resident members on the church book and twenty-one persons as members of the congregation. This makes a total of one hundred and eight. Steps to increase the subscription list met with a generous response, and the trustees expect to have enough pledged within the next few weeks to meet all the expenses of the ensuing year. Mrs. A. J. Nichols read a fine poem commemorating the year's work. A new floor has been laid in the basement which is henceforth to be known as the Social Room, and a new steropticon has been installed.

Church of our Father Lancaster, Pa.
Rev. E. R. Shippen Minister

For some time a movement has been on foot among the men of the Church of Our Father, Unitarian, to form a laymen's organization, and it culminated on Thursday evening, when the first meeting was held. An excellent supper was served in Emerson Hall at seven o'clock, after which the business of the meeting was transacted. A committee of five was appointed to report to the next meeting nominations for the various offices to be filled, together with constitution and by-laws, which shall govern the body.

By request, Mr. M. T. Garvin read the paper he had read before the Ministerial Association last Monday, on the "Spirit and Needs of Lancaster." A lengthy discussion followed the reading, which was participated in by Messrs. Warren S. Rehm, Maurice E. Weaver, Rev. Dr. John W. Cooper, W. S. Doebler, H. G. Grosh, John M. Moore, Dr. B. F. Shaub, C. V. Lichty, Fred S. Pyfer and others. The club is catholic in spirit, and includes in its membership liberal men of all churches and no church. Its object as set forth in its call is to—

1. Promote social intercourse and discussion among all men of liberal religious beliefs and broad aims.

2. To quicken the interest of liberal men in everything that affects the corporate and individual welfare of the city, and to increase the activities that bear upon our common civic life.

3. To meet every month from October to May for supper, to be followed by an address and discussion of the same. Smoking will be allowed.

4. The club will become affiliated with the National League of Unitarian Laymen, of which President Taft is the head.

The club begins its career auspiciously with forty members. The next meeting will be held in March.

Church of the Messiah Louisville, Ky.

Rev. Maxwell Savage was installed minister of this church on Tuesday evening, March 8. Rev. Frank S. C. Wicks of Indianapolis, Ind., led the responsive reading and gave the invocation. Rev. Minot Simons of Cleveland, Ohio, read from the Scriptures and offered prayer. A hymn, written for the occasion by Dr. Minot J. Savage, was sung, after which Rev. Franklin C. Southworth preached the installation sermon. The act of installation was performed by Mr. Alfred Pirtle, chairman of the Board of Trustees; and the right hand of fellowship was extended by Rev. George A. Thayer, D. D., of Cincinnati, Ohio. Rev. Ernest Charles Smith made the address to the people.

Morgantown, W. Va. The Unitarian Church celebrated its first anniversary, on the evening of March 7, by a social gathering at the home of Prof. Charles H. Patterson. About forty people were present, and a pleasant and profitable evening was enjoyed. The young society has only a small membership of thirty persons, but has a brave spirit and maintains a hopeful outlook. It occupies a most important place in a university town that is growing by leaps and bounds.

Unitarian Conference of the Middle States and Canada

President—Adelbert Moot, Esq., Buffalo, N. Y.
Secretary—Rev. George H. Badger, 104 East 20th St., New York
Treasurer—Cyril H. Burdett, 135 Broadway, New York

CHURCHES

New York—Manhattan: (All Souls; Church of the Messiah; Lenox Ave. Church); Brooklyn: (Church of the Savior; Second Church; Unity Church; Fourth Church; South Brooklyn; Willow Place Chapel); Richmond: (Church of the Redeemer, Staten Island;) Queensborough (Flushing); Albany; Barneveld; Buffalo: (First Church; Parkside Church): Dunkirk; Gouverneur; Ithaca; Jamestown; Newburgh; Rochester; Schenectady; Syracuse; Troy; Yonkers

New Jersey—Elizabeth; Hackensack; Montclair; Orange; Passaic; Plainfield; Ridgewood; Rutherford; Summit; Vineland.

Pennsylvania—Philadelphia: (First Church; Spring Garden Church; Germantown); Erie; Homestead; Lancaster; Franklin; McKeesport; Meadville; New Castle; Pittsburgh: (First Church; Northside Church, Allegheny).

Delaware—Wilmington.

Maryland—Baltimore.

District of Columbia—Washington

West Virginia—Morgantown; Wheeling.

Canada—Montreal; Toronto; Ottawa; Hamilton; London.

NEW YORK UNITARIAN HEADQUARTERS

104 East Twentieth Street, New York

Unitarian Book Room: Morehouse Memorial Library: New York League of Unitarian Women: New York Office of American Unitarian Association.

Headquarters of the Unitarian Conference of the Middle States and Canada.

MISS FLORENCE M. BISCHOFF, Clerk.

Office Hours: Mornings from 9:30 to 1:00
Afternoons from 2:00 to 5:00
Not open Saturday afternoon or holidays.

Our Constructive Issues

I. We stand for an open and an honest pulpit; for freedom in truth-seeking, courage in truth-speaking, and the reverence of unfaltering sincerity in all issues of religion.

II. We stand for religion that identifies itself explicitly with pure living, high thinking, and noble aspiring. The essential business of the church, we believe, is not to fortify a theology but to promote righteousness: and we make the basis of church fellowship not credal agreement but moral oneness of purpose.

III. We stand for a religion of the Here and Now. Believing resolutely in Immortality, we insist that the first experiences of Immortality are in this world's living present: and God's sharing of To-day with us brings religion's chief concern.

IV. We stand for the final authority of reason and conscience in the things of religion. We believe that no outward church or institution has right to impose a creed, or establish a method of discipline, or define an exclusive fellowship of faith that shall stand paramount to the individual soul's responsibility of conscience and reason in determining faith, conduct, and spiritual comradeship.

V. We stand for a progressive theology conditioned on faith in a progressive revelation. We stand for an interpretation of God and God's method of revelation, of the nature of Man, and future destiny, that shall constantly square with the latest teaching of science and largest attainments of human society in ethical ideal and spiritual vision.